DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 328 168 HE 024 222

AUTHOR McMinn, William G.
TITLE Review of Programs: Architecture; Architectural Technology; Landscape Architecture; Interior Design; Construction and Construction Technology; Building Construction; Urban and Regional Planning. Report to the Board of Regents, State University System of Florida.
INSTITUTION State Univ. System of Florida, Tallahassee. Board of Regents.
REPORT NO BOR-88-8
PUB DATE Mar 88
NOTE 107p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Architectural Drafting; *Architectural Education; Building Design; Construction (Process); *Educational Demand; *Educational Planning; Higher Education; Interior Design; Landscaping; Technical Education
IDENTIFIERS Program Review; *State University System of Florida

ABSTRACT

This report is an update of a report on the development and status of various programs in architecture and related fields in the State University System of Florida, a report that was submitted to the Board of Regents in May 1983. The objectives of this updated report, like those of the earlier one, are to review the anticipated needs of the various professions for qualified personnel, to attempt to project the growth of the state, and to match the institutional requirements for professional education in these related areas. Schools represented in the review are Florida State University at Tallahassee, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University at Tallahassee, University of Florida at Gainesville, University of South Florida at Tampa, Florida International University (FIU) at Miami, Florida Atlantic University (FAU) at Boca Raton, and University of Miami at Coral Gables. Two centers were also visited: Florida Center for Urban Design at Tampa, and FAU/FIU Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems at Fort Lauderdale. Prior to the program reviews, the 10 original 1983 consultants' recommendations are provided, as well as program evaluations based on the developments that occurred during the interim in response to each recommendation. Appendices include the site visit schedule, a list of the university coordinators, the consultants' vitae, and the academic degree program inventory through January 1988 for all the schools in the report. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: HE

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. 50

ED328168

PROGRAM REVIEW OF

ARCHITECTURE, ARCHITECTURAL TECHNOLOGY, LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE, INTERIOR DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION AND CONSTRUCTION TECHNOLOGY, BUILDING CONSTRUCTION, URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

State University System of Florida

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 12422

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA

MAY, 1989

REPORT TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS
STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA

REVIEW OF PROGRAMS

ARCHITECTURE
ARCHITECTURAL TECHNOLOGY
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
INTERIOR DESIGN
CONSTRUCTION AND
CONSTRUCTION TECHNOLOGY
BUILDING CONSTRUCTION
URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING

William G. McMinn, FAIA
Dean
College of Architecture Art & Planning
Cornell University
Lead Consultant

BOR 88-8

March 1988
Board of Regents
State University System of Florida
Tallahassee, Florida

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
GENERAL SUMMARY	6
RESPONSE TO 1983 CONSULTANTS' RECOMMENDATIONS	8
PROGRAM EVALUATIONS	
Architecture	15
Architecture at UF	18
Architecture at FAMU	21
Architecture at UM	23
Architecture at FAMU/USF	26
Architectural Technology	30
Architectural Technology at FAMU	30
Architectural Technology at FIU	31
Interior Design	33
Interior Design at UF	33
Interior Design at FSU	35
Interior Design at FIU	38
Landscape Architecture	40
Landscape Architecture at UF	40
Landscape Architecture at FIU	43
Building Construction	44
Building Construction at UF	44
Construction Management at FIU	47
Urban and Regional Planning	48
Florida Center for Urban Design and Research	49
Planning at FSU	51
Planning at UF	53
Planning at UM	55
Planning at FAU	56
PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS	59
APPENDIX A Site Visit Schedule	71
APPENDIX B University Coordinators	79
APPENDIX C Consultant's Vitae	83
APPENDIX D Inventory Degree Programs	91

INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared as an update to a report on the status of programs in architecture and related fields in the State University System submitted to the Board of Regents in May, 1983. That report reviewed the anticipated needs of the various professions for qualified personnel and attempted to project the growth of the state and match the institutional requirements for professional education in these related areas. Each of the various programs was also reviewed in detail and provided the Board a set of evaluations and recommendations as determined by the team.

Following the format prepared for that report, this review documents the developments in the various programs during the five year interval since 1983. In preparation for this review each program was asked to prepare a self-study to define the changes in its program during the period, and in addition to the basic data as to the current status of the program, to provide a formal response to the observations and recommendations contained in the 1983 report.

During January, 1988 site visits were arranged to each program under review at the following campuses:

Florida State University (FSU) at Tallahassee

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU) at Tallahassee

University of Florida (UF) at Gainesville

University of South Florida (FAMU/USF) at Tampa

Florida International University (FIU) at Miami

Florida Atlantic University (FAU) at Boca Raton

University of Miami (UM) at Coral Gables

In addition, the following two centers were visited:

Florida Center for Urban Design at Tampa

FAU/FIU Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems at Fort Lauderdale

All of the above programs are state funded through the State University System (SUS), with the exception of the University of Miami which requested participation in this review.

The chart below was included in the 1983 report with primary changes in the programs indicated in bold letters.

HEGIS	UF	FAMU	FSU	FAMU USF	FIU	UM	FAU
0202 Architecture	6GP	56GP		4G	(P)	5P	
0235 Arch. Technology		4P			4P		
0203 Interior Design	4P		4P+2G		4		
0204 Landscape Architecture	4P+2G				3G	(P)	
0206 Urban and Regional Planning	2GP		2GP+GP PhD		2GP	2G	
0208 Building Construction or Construction Management	4P+2GP			4P+2G			
College wide	(PhD)						

LEGEND

4, 5, 6, 2	Minimal years to complete
G	Graduate
P	Professionally Accredited
+	Study Beyond Accredited Degree
()	Proposed

The above chart is overly simplified and the various combinations of degree programs cannot be shown. However, the new programs that have been implemented within the last five years are indicated by the bold figures. It might be noted that parallel programs have been planned or implemented in almost all disciplines in the HEGIS category since the review in 1983.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is basically a positive report in that there have been some improvements in all of the programs with significant improvements in several places.

The major improvements and developments during the five year period:

1. The new administration of the College of Architecture at UF has given attention to all programs and new priorities towards research and new advanced degrees.
2. The new building and full accreditiation for B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs at FAMU brings maturity and confidence to the School of Architecture.
3. New faculty appointments in the graduate planning program at FSU brings new excellence to the program.
4. The new status as a School of Architecture at UM with its own Dean has given prominence locally and nationally to the program.
5. The major construction program in the state remains at UF but the construction management program at FIU has achieved a much improved status.
6. The new graduate Landscape Architecture program at FIU has a good beginning with a small but dedicated faculty and almost adequate facilities and equipment.
7. Although competing with under-enrolled programs at UF, FSU and UM, the new planning program at FAU has good academic base for development with broad university and research support.

8. The Florida Center for Urban Design and Research at Tampa has established its goals and staffed itself well. It now requires patience, funding, and some opportunities to demonstrate its abilities.

Major Concerns for the Future:

9. The new FAMU/USF program in architecture developed by FAMU faculty and located at USF is awkward in administration which will create difficulties in the development of the program. The program should be either "unjointed" and assigned to USF for development or be totally the responsibility of FAMU as a degree program located in Tampa.
10. The design programs at FIU (Architectural Technology, Interior Design) require space, equipment, and faculty positions necessary to reach professional status.
11. The Interior Design program at FSU remains limited by funding and facilities.
12. The rigidity of the State Board of Architecture in determining the curriculum necessary for examination for licensure in the State of Florida is challenging the right of the academic programs to develop new courses and innovative programs with NAAB (accrediting board) review.

GENERAL SUMMARY

In the five year period since the review of 1983, there have been important and often impressive changes within the academic programs of architecture and related fields of the State of Florida. New programs have been proposed or implemented, older programs have been enriched and improved, and leadership has changed at almost all levels within the institutions. All programs have been reviewed for accreditation during this period by the appropriate organization and many have developed professional advisory groups to the program to provide the important and necessary contact between the academic and practicing arms of the professions.

In general, the student populations of the various programs have been maintained at approximately the same levels as in 1983. Two notable exceptions are the new 5 year B.Arch. program at FAMU, which has had an increase, and the planned decrease at UF in architecture. The next five years may find a greater change within enrollments of the existing programs as the impact of new or proposed programs becomes more evident. The faculty component of these programs has changed little in number during the five year period. Internal changes in the faculties have been a result of a limited number of retirements or resignations. Most of the programs have maintained their strengths during the period and several show significant improvements. This lack of major change in the programs during a period of dynamic growth within the State raises the question of the ability of the academic institutions to respond to the needs of the state. During this dynamic period of physical and social change within the state, the primary

change is in the number of programs with increased duplication in the various disciplines.

The principal changes in facilities are evident in the new building for the School of Architecture at FAMU and the relocation of the School of Architecture at UM to renovated dormitories, with an announced addition in the planning stages. There has been some internal modification of spaces at UF to accommodate a growing research program, and planning is underway for additional space to accommodate both studio and research areas. The new "cooperative" FAMU/USF program at Tampa is being temporarily housed off-campus while programming the new facility. Space remains a critical element at FSU (Interior Design) and an increasingly major problem at FIU in the lack of studio areas for Architectural Design, Interior Design and an emerging graduate program in Landscape Architecture only temporarily solved.

There is an impressive and important commitment to computer education in all programs varying only by the degree of ability to support the hardware and provide the necessary qualified faculty. There seems to be a clear recognition by programs of the role that the computer must have in professional education. Computer accessibility provides a base for instruction in most areas and facilitates research. Particularly noteworthy are the extensive computer facilities that have been added to the College of Architecture at UF which will increase the instructional and research capacity of the College. The computer facilities at FAMU in the School of Architecture provide a significant resource for that program. The new graduate program in Landscape Architecture at FIU and the new graduate program in Architecture at FAMU/USF have impressive computer facilities adjacent to design studios in their temporary locations. The new school at UM has received a major

allocation for facilities, and the planning programs at FSU and FAU have appropriate access for their students. The ID program at FSU and the programs at FIU have minimal facilities.

SUMMARY of CHANGE in HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENTS

		1983	1986	Change
Architecture				
	UF	805	719	-86
	FAMU	160	247	+87
	UM	354	364	+10
	FAMU/USF	0	12	+12
Arch Tech & Const Tech		(combined)		
	FAMU	77	40	-37
	FIU	290	291	+1
Planning				
	UF	40	53	+13
	FSU	66	71	+5
	UM	8		
Interior Design				
	UF	82	125	+43
	FSU	309	301	-8
	FIU	79	63	-16
Landscape Architecture				
	UF	102	116	+14
	FIU	0	4	+4
Building Construction				
	UF	377	377	0

1983 CONSULTANTS' RECOMMENDATIONS

As part of the 1983 review the consulting committee was asked to develop recommendations for the Board of Regents' consideration. The 10 recommendations were extracted and analyzed by the staff of the Board. It is important in this five-year summary to review those original recommendations and developments within the programs in the interim period of time.

1. The output of interior designers and urban and regional planners should be increased by expansion of existing programs as student manpower demands increase and as Florida's population grows.

The staff analysis agreed that existing programs were adequate to meet the continuing demand for qualified personnel with moderate increases in student enrollment. The consultants observed at that time the underpopulated programs in planning throughout the State, the most critical being the UM graduate program and to a lesser degree the FSU and the UF programs. An increase in graduate funding in those programs, increased visibility, and aggressive recruiting should have provided the existing programs with a larger pool of qualified applicants. In the five year period under review, there has been an additional program in planning approved for Florida Atlantic University. There has been a decline in the enrollment of the Interior Design program at FIU and a maintenance of the large enrollment in the Interior Design program at FSU with an increase in its graduate enrollment.

2. Existing programs in urban and regional planning and interior design should provide continuing education opportunities for professionals living in urban centers of the State.

The graduate planning program at FSU is now offering a degree program in Tampa for professionals located in that area and the UM planning program has begun an executive planning degree program with courses scheduled for weekend participation. Such programs as these are innovative responses to this recommendation. The Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems has scheduled a number of conferences during the recent years to bring the

issues of growth to the public and to the profession. The state professional organization in interior design has worked with the three major academic programs in the state in order that they might become more involved with developments in the profession. There seems to be an increase in such activities in both of these fields.

3. The output of Florida educated architects, landscape architects, and construction managers should be increased by establishing new programs in the two largest urban areas of the State as soon as it is feasible.

The first class of a new school of architecture is now completing its first year at Tampa. The cooperative program of FAMU/USF is a clear response to this recommendation and begins to fill the need in architecture. In a similar way, the new graduate program at FIU in Landscape Architecture has attracted a dedicated group of students for its first class. The two programs in construction technology (FIU and FAMU) have shifted the focus of their programs to emphasize the management aspects of the profession.

4. Landscape architecture programs that are traditionally project scale design oriented should be supplemented by greater emphasis on land management issues arising from ecological concerns.

While there is some evidence of the attention of the UF program in Landscape Architecture to such issues, the new graduate program in that College and the new program at FIU with its connection to the Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems offers a greater opportunity for significant attention to such problems for the State.

5. Development of new programs should not diminish the strengths of existing programs.

The newness of the graduate program in architecture at Tampa has yet to impact the numbers in the existing graduate programs at FAMU or UF. The healthy condition of most student enrollments at this time would suggest little change due to new programs. However, a new planning program at FAU may seriously affect the other programs in the state, especially FSU which it most closely resembles. The potential of reestablishing the five-year B.Arch. program at UF will have a major impact on all architecture programs in the state. The proposed extension of the architecture technology program at FIU to a five-year program in architecture will also impact the enrollments of all of the similar undergraduate programs in architecture.

6. Opportunities should be sought to bring blacks into the mainstream of professional practice in the disciplines reviewed.

There is evidence that all programs have worked aggressively at minority recruitment, accommodation, and retention. In many cases this is accomplished with increased tutoring, scholarship funds, and the use of role models as visiting lecturers. The program in architecture at FAMU reports an increase of 35 (18.4%) to 77 (27%) in black enrollment in its program. Among other examples is the establishment of the Black Student Contractors at UF.

7. Programs in environmental policy, design, and construction should focus on multidisciplinary approaches to problem solving and promote students' interactions with disciplines outside their chosen majors.

An example of a response to this recommendation is the establishment of the Florida Center for Urban Design and Research in Tampa which will serve as a center for graduate students training in sponsored projects and problems in the state. In a similar way the continued support of the Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems will provide student involvement in the complicated problems of the state. Within the academic programs there are isolated examples of connections with other areas; however, these seem to remain regretfully limited.

8. Programs in state supported universities should provide instruction relating professional practice to the unique climate, geology, demography, economy, and political character of Florida.

All programs would accept the stated premise and draw from the region, sites and locations for academic problems focussing on the characteristics of the State of Florida. These programs must balance the localized concerns against the broader preparation for a professional career regardless of location. The problem "general against the specific" in professional education is a continuing discussion in academia; however, it does appear that all programs in the State have established "Centers for Caribbean Study." These special centers and institutes can provide opportunities for serious investigations.

9. Consideration should be given to modification of existing programs to allow students completing general programs at the lower division to select a major in architecture at the beginning of the junior year without requiring additional time for completion of the major.

Most of the programs which offer a professional degree have articulated their programs with certain junior colleges to allow students to move into advance standing with little difficulty. Automatic transfer is undesirable due to the difference in student performance and college programs. However, each program was clear in its efforts to work with the faculty of the junior colleges to avoid unnecessary duplication or additional time for the student. In fact, the faculty in all programs in all universities are sensitive to this problem and provide means of advanced placement for the qualified student. Good counseling is the key to smooth transfer arrangements.

10. In addition to any specializations, an option should be available in any professional program of quality to prepare students for entry into the main stream of the profession.

While specializations are important in providing opportunities to pursue in-depth special areas of interest, there is a difficulty when the only path to the professional degree is through the selection of an area of specialization. This recommendation was directed toward the graduate architecture programs at FAMU and UF and their requirements for the completion of highly specialized options to receive the first-professional degree. Since 1983 FAMU has developed the five-year B.Arch. program which permits

entry into the "mainstream" and the program at UF which allows its design option to serve that intent.

Summary:

There has been progress by the various programs in all of these recommendations abstracted from the 1983 report, and serious efforts towards improvements are clearly noted in all programs under review. The difficulties of linkages, connections, cooperative, and joint programs remain a paramount difficulty for the various academic units in the State. The Board of Regents has required combined, associated, or related programs between the universities with little evidence of success. In a similar way, the programs are encouraged to seek connections within their own institutions, but most find such attempts frustrating.

Unlike joint research projects, instructional relations with other disciplines are often awkward and other programs are often unsupportive of the educational methods of the design studio. The time component of design in most programs places it in a primary role on the faculty and students' priority list. Those programs, such as planning based in the social sciences, can develop close relations with economics, sociology, and geography, while the building construction programs can relate to programs in management and in civil engineering. The technical areas of architecture often have closer relation with computer science and material science programs than with the design area. A complex world requires increased interaction within its academic institutions as representative of the connections within the professions.

PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

This discussion of the individual programs is intended to be read as an update of the activities of the programs since 1983. This report will concentrate on observations of the changes that have occurred in the various programs during the five-year period rather than provide basic program descriptions or duplicate professional accreditation reports.

ARCHITECTURE

At the time of the 1983 review there were three accredited programs in architecture within the State. It was noted that each seems to reflect its institution, its mission, and its place. The three programs were diverse in their curricula arrangements and distinct in their intentions. The UM program requires five years to receive its professional B.Arch. degree, while the UF program requires four years of undergraduate education followed by two years of graduate work receiving the M.Arch. on completion as the first professional degree. In a similar way, the then new program at FAMU requires four years for the baccalaureate followed by two years of specialization for its M.Arch. which is designated as the first-professional degree.

Since that time the architecture program at FAMU has received initial accreditation for its five-year B.Arch. program. The M.Arch. program has been accredited since 1980. The program at FAMU has developed multiple entry and exit points for the benefit of the student. The program at UF has concentrated its graduate options but has retained the 4+2 model as appropriate to its institution and to its college organization of professional

programs. At the time of the site visit to UF the faculty were discussing the reestablishment of its five-year B.Arch. program which would have a major impact on the balance of programs in architecture within the State and on its own programs within the College. The program at UM has developed its five-year program with a new emphasis on its graduate design program.

Thus, since the last review all three of the accredited programs within the State are moving toward a similar structure of five year programs with graduate programs in special areas for advanced study. There seems to be an evolution towards duplication within the existing programs, but this could be a positive step in creating a format that allows for ease of transfer between programs.

The major development since the 1983 review is the establishment of a new cooperative program in Tampa between FAMU and USF. This program is designed as a four-year graduate M.Arch. program, although advanced placement may be awarded to applicants with previous credit in undergraduate programs in architecture. The 1983 report recommended that additional programs could be supported by the State if the focus of the program met the needs of the urban student in the more heavily populated areas of the State.

In Miami, as the other center of population in the State, FIU has continued to press for a program awarding a professional degree. Several attempts to receive approval by the BOR have been made, but the lack of clear institutional support at the time of a changing university administration and the concern of duplication with the non-state supported program of UM has made its progress difficult. At the time of the site visit, the faculty in the program of Architectural Technology had decided to focus their energy on developing a four-year program with sufficient quality that

its graduates can receive a professional degree with the completion of an additional year at one of the five-year programs or admission to a graduate program for an additional two years.

A serious problem has developed within the State of Florida since the review in 1983 in the deterioration of the relation between the Florida Registration Board for the Licensing of Architects and the state academic programs. The state board has established a prescriptive model of architectural curricula which is now applied to all graduates of accredited programs. Any applicant to the state licensing examination must satisfy these curricula requirements regardless of the accreditation standards of the profession. This unique process is limited to Florida and has created an unsatisfactory relation between the schools and the board. Despite several attempts at discussion of the issues of professional accreditation, the board seems unyielding in its interpretation of the necessary requirements of education for architecture as determined by the board.

These mandatory requirements have limited the faculty's development of curricula and diminished their authority in seeking new ways of bringing the knowledge of architecture to the student. This has affected all programs in architecture and has inhibited the search for new and innovative methods of teaching or arrangements of curricula requirements. As new courses are developed, the programs will be unable to satisfy the requirements of the Florida Board for Architecture. Universities are about to change as they meet their responsibilities for the addition and development of new knowledge. The education and the examination for the profession of architecture must be in concert to improve the profession and its education.

Architecture at UF

The 1983 report noted that, as the oldest program in architecture in the State (1925), it has a rich history of leadership in the profession. Its special strength lay in its rich diversity of graduate options and its administrative connections to programs in the allied fields within the College. This collection of programs in the built environment remains as one of the potentials for excellence if the collection can be connected. Several new programs such as the new computer facilities and additional increase in research activities should begin to encourage a new level of interaction between the programs. There is an increase in combined studios with Landscape Architecture, Interior Design, and the graduate program in planning. While a bit tentative at the present, the efforts are commendable and should be encouraged.

The new concentration in the technology areas is impressive. The establishment of a research center (ARCHTEC) will provide a new direction for the Department and, with the assistance of the new doctorate program in the College, should develop a major new initiative for architecture at UF with connections to many of the sciences. In addition to the general computer facilities within the College, there is a new CAD system laboratory with extensive computer equipment for the training of a new generation of architects. Unfortunately, this laboratory is removed from the traditional studios. To be effective it should be considered as an extension of the studio experience, providing a new tool for the designer and therefore placed in closer proximity to the studios.

The 1983 report commented with concern on the rigidity of the curriculum in architecture, and the faculty are addressing this issue. The report

also expressed concern on the "internalization" of the programs and the lack of formal connections within the University. There seems to be less attention to this concern, although the new Ph.D. program may provide linkages.

There has not been any increase in physical space for the College since the 1983 review, and the creation of computer facilities has been at the expense of classrooms or studios. Additional research activities have acquired spaces previously allocated to studios, thereby creating tensions within the programs. Plans are under discussion for new construction, but this seems some time away. Temporary solutions should be arranged in order that the program in design be maintained at the best possible level in recognition of the numbers in design at the lower level.

Two major issues which impact the total numbers in architectural programs in the state are the consideration of the reestablishment of the five-year B.Arch. program and the enrollment patterns within the program at UF. The enrollment of the entire program has gradually decreased by intention during the five-year period. The three gates of freshman entry, junior entry, and graduate admission serve to assure the quality of the program; but the large attrition raises the question of the efficiency of the program. The previous report commented on this concern, and it remains in the program today with 623 undergraduates in the first four years and 96 in the two-year graduate program. Approximately 150 graduates of the undergraduate program must be compared to 50 graduates from the professional M.Arch. program. Given the Department's stated desire to attract graduate students from other programs, the question of the School's ability to supply an adequate number of graduates with the professional degree annually in the state as well as the amount of resources required to provide foundation

education in architecture for students who are not accepted into the advanced levels, it seems appropriate for the faculty and the administration to consider these numbers and develop more appropriate ratios.

The faculty are mindful of these problems and have worked to reduce the faculty/student ratios in the lower levels, accepting fewer students into the upper division at the junior level. The design work exhibited in these lower levels is impressive and will be difficult to maintain in all sections of the design sections. Perhaps more importantly, it will be a particular challenge to maintain a continual sequence of quality in upper levels and into graduate programs.

In summary, the State continues to be well served, in a phrase taken from the 1983 report, by its oldest program in architecture. The decrease in enrollment has yet to reach a level of concern. The new research and doctoral programs in technology have the potential for excellence appropriate to a university with the breadth of programs. The enrichment programs in preservation and foreign study provide an important dimension for the students, and the future involvement in the Center for Urban Design will help to develop the urban experience for graduate students in design.

The new leadership in the Dean of the College and the potential of new leadership in the Department Chairman should assure continued quality within the programs. The spirit of interaction between the units within the College appears to be developing despite the problems of competition for resources.

Architecture at FAMU

At the time of the 1983 review this program was still in a period of development, having been established in 1975. Since that review there have been significant changes and a continual development of this program. The school has clearly reached a level of maturity that will permit it to build depth in its programs and bring recognition to the University and to the State. The two important developments since the 1983 review are the completion of the new building and the new curricula structure with multiple options responsive to student interests.

The new building for the program is an impressive accomplishment as a stated demonstration of the openness of the study of architecture and the technical intentions of the program at FAMU. The building seems to have begun to fit the faculty and students and provides accommodation for the vitality necessary to a professional program in architecture. Surprisingly, the studio areas, which are usually the heart and core of a school of architecture, are isolated from each other and dimly lit. A portion of the structure is assigned to the research activities of the Institute of Building Sciences, a research arm of the School dedicated to sponsored projects. This allocation of space for research is a response to the early commitment of the School and has developed into an important part of the total program. A full-time director and staff are now in place and an impressive list of projects are now underway. The early decision to focus on building research has continued to mature as the academic program has developed. The new facilities should be a major asset in the promotion of this Institute.

The second major development in the School is the introduction of a

five-year B.Arch. program. One of the recommendations of the 1983 report was to bring the program more into the mainstream of the profession, and the School has accomplished this by the new and now accredited program. The School has maintained its graduate program with some concentration of its options. There are many entry and exit points within its program to accommodate individual student goals. All of its programs have now received professional accreditation. The significant increase in the student enrollment is due to the establishment of the new five year program and its accredition status, the new facility, and the aggressive promotion of the program in the professional press.

The School has maintained its program in Washington as an important urban experience for its students. The program is now combined with a consortium of schools with similar programs to maximize resources and should both provide a greater interaction with other students and faculty. Additional attention has been given to off-campus experiences in summer programs developed with other schools of architecture. The flexibility of the program to accommodate these arrangements and the dedication of the faculty to promote these activities is significant.

The challenges for the future will be for the School to maintain the pool of applicants for its programs, the continual building of depth in its academic courses, and the important interaction with its own institution and with the adjacent programs at FSU in planning and interior design. The previous report commented on the lack of relation between FAMU as a special university with a mission for the state and the developing school. In the list of ten strengths of the School prepared by the faculty in the self-study, there is an indirect mention of the special responsibilities of the

School to minorities.

The School is still sensitive to changes and development of other programs in architecture throughout the State. A large section of its student body comes from the south Florida area and new or enlarged programs in that area will significantly impact the enrollment of this School. The faculty of the School have participated in the development of the new joint program with USF and as a graduate program it does not compete with the undergraduate program at FAMU, but the long term development of that and other programs may begin to have an effect on enrollment. The relation to the cooperative program at USF and other programs within the State must be articulated with greater clarity than now exists.

The School has positioned itself well in the State and in the region for its future. The visibility of the building, the recognition of its special thrusts in research, and the location near the state capital commend itself to a positive future. The search for a new Dean to continue the development of the School is critical to the continued success of the programs. The unfortunate delay is not in the best interest of the programs, and the important decisions and participation with professional and state agencies are critical to the future. The second decade of the School might be termed the adolescent period with some awkwardness, some signs of maturity, and considerable youthful energy and enthusiasm.

Architecture at UM

Although the University of Miami is not a state supported institution, the program in architecture does have a direct relation to the academic environments for the study of architecture within the State of Florida. As

a program located in one of the major cities of the world which has become the center of political, financial, and social influence, there is the potential for a significant school of architecture. The University has recognized the opportunity and moved rapidly to bring the program to the forefront of its priorities and to give it the visibility and support that it must have to achieve excellence.

The School requested participation in this review, as it did in the 1983 review. Since that review there have been significant developments for the School that have placed it in a major position within the institution and within the group of major schools of architecture in the country. This includes the designation of the program in 1983 as a School of Architecture separate from the School of Engineering where it had had departmental status since its beginning in 1953. The autonomy and visibility a of separate program administered by its own Dean was a major step and long overdue for the program.

In concert with that step was the relocation of the new School to renovated dormitories which serve well for the studios, offices, and limited support functions of the program. This move provides identity in the campus setting and is important as a physical statement of the newness of the School. The announcement of a new structure designed by a major world-class architect (Aldo Rossi) as his first building in America has brought additional attention to the new/old program at UM. The publicity associated with this event, together with a positive review in a national professional architectural journal, the extensive distinguished visitors program, and the recent accomplishments in design of its students and faculty has served to bring prominence to the program and attention to its activities.

The academic curriculum of the School follows the five-year B.Arch. model. At the time of the 1983 review this was the only five-year program in the State. However, since that time FAMU has initiated a five-year program and UF faculty are discussing a similar move. These developments within the state system may have a significant impact on the privately-supported program in recognition of the tuition differential between UM and the state programs. The present enrollment of the School is capped at the same level as the enrollment in 1983 (350). However, the current figures of the self study show that 75 percent of the students are in the upper three years of the program, indicating the importance of the transfer program and articulation with the junior colleges in the Miami area. Discussions with the faculty during the review suggested that the number of mid-stream transfers were decreasing and a larger percentage were beginning their academic studies as freshmen in the program at UM. There is also an increase in applicants from outside the state and the program has been aggressively promoted.

The School sees itself as a participant in the "cutting edge" of the design world particularly in Miami, from the historical areas of design of Miami Beach's Art Deco and the Coral Gables community to the dynamic design developments in downtown Miami. The lecture programs for the design community of Miami bring attention to the central focus of the School and maintain an important link with the professionals of the city and southern section of the State. The new attention to its graduate program in architecture as a post-professional program will bring depth to its undergraduate program and challenges for its faculty. In addition to its graduate program in architecture, which will join the existing graduate program in planning,

the School has received authorization to begin a new program in Landscape Architecture and to consider the development of a second new program in Interior Architecture. Both of these fields are important to the Miami area and offer the potential for major career opportunities. Developments such as these will bring the private School into a competitive position with the well-established programs at UF and more directly with the newly emerging programs in these areas at FIU. The development of additional programs will provide breadth for the UM School, but the resource base will have to be greatly extended to support excellence in all these programs.

The program in architecture at UM has moved rapidly into one of prominence in the national scene. The visibility of its new Dean, the recognition of its faculty, many of whom have served long years at the institution with dedication, and others who have joined the program in recent times with commitment to its promise, the attention to its new and proposed facilities, and the total Miami environment have combined to provide the base for a dynamic center for the study of architecture. The challenge of the future will be to develop the substance to equal the surface.

Architecture at the FAMU/USF Cooperative Program in Tampa

Long before the 1983 review, the Tampa architectural community had worked to establish a program in architecture in their city. During that review, meetings with architects in the city gave strong support to the development of a professional program of which discussions were just beginning. In 1986 the first class was admitted to the new program developed by faculty of FAMU's Achool of Architecture and located almost on the USF campus. The program was designed as a first-professional graduate

program intended for those students who have received no previous training in a professional school of architecture, although advanced placement is possible for students who have received the four-year undergraduate degree from UF, FAMU, or FIU upon portfolio review. Enrollment is planned at approximately 200.

The program requires four years of full-time graduate study to complete, making it the only program of its type in the country. Most of the professional graduate programs may be completed in three to three and half years, but discussions with the director indicated that the curriculum required eight semesters in order to satisfy the requirements of the State Board of Architecture for admission to the professional examination, which is another example of the inappropriate interference in academic programs by a state agency.

Initially, the courses in the new School were offered in the evening, as most of its students hold part or full-time jobs; however, the faculty are now planning more classes and studios during the day in order that a student might schedule a full semester's credits. As the number of hours that a student may take in any one term are limited by the evening schedule, it will require many more than four years for most students to complete the full program. Many students expressed their belief that for them it will require six years or more of study if the present schedule of evening classes continues. The program was designed to provide an opportunity for the working graduate to complete a professional program in architecture while maintaining a full-time job as well as the full-time student who has completed a prior undergraduate program.

Very few programs in the country have been able to develop a successful school following this model. Boston and Philadelphia have the two notable and long-standing examples, both of which are fully accredited. It should be noted that one of the reasons given for this model is that the development of a graduate program would not be competitive with the professional undergraduate program at FAMU. The program is being developed as a "stand alone" graduate program which will provide a challenge for its faculty to establish a first-professional sequence of courses at the graduate level for architecture. The endowment of two Scholars' chairs will greatly assist the program.

The School is closely identified with the development of the new state-funded Florida Center for Urban Design & Research. Two of the permanent staff of the center are members of the faculty of the new School, and one of the stated goals of the program is to provide a focus on "urban architecture" and to investigate the pressures of private and public development within the urban context.

It is premature to judge the success of this new program, as it is only in its second year and is still defining its goals, refining its curriculum, and recruiting its faculty and future students. The first class of 14 students are dedicated, supportive, but a bit apprehensive about the long range future of the program. Some degree of confusion seems to exists among the students as to the degree structure and where the academic responsibility for the program lies.

The cooperative degree suggests a shared responsibility between the two institutions of FAMU and USF, but there is a lack of clarity of institutional control. The development and approval of courses, the monitoring of the

quality of content, and the recruitment of additional faculty makes the combined program difficult to administer, for there are not clear lines of administration for the program. It is difficult enough to develop a new program with the most direct lines of support, but this seems unduly complicated, at least initially. Discussions with faculty in Tampa and Tallahassee, students enrolled in the program, and administrators at both institutions did little to clarify or satisfy questions of budget or academic processes for the program. The future of this program will be dependent on the continued support and goodwill of the profession, the quality of the students it attracts and accepts, the depth of intellectual and professional expertise of its faculty, and the innovative and energetic leadership necessary to develop the required levels of funding support for the new program. One must note that the selection of the new Dean of the School of Architecture at FAMU is certain to impact the program depending on priority and interest in the responsibility for the cooperative program in Tampa.

While space on any academic campus is a primary problem, the present location in an office park adjacent but removed from the University makes the development of an academic environment difficult. The atmosphere currently approaches an architectural office rather than an architectural school. Attention must be paid to its setting and its facilities to provide appropriate interaction with the other units of the University and the identification of a major professional program.

ARCHITECTURAL TECHNOLOGY

At the time of the 1983 review there were two programs (FAMU and FIU) that are given this designation in the State, and those two remain at the time of the current review. Although there has been development during the interim period, the basic intention of these programs is to provide a qualified person able to perform in the industry and make valuable contributions in diverse ways to the success of building projects. The two programs are different in their institutional setting and curriculum structure.

Architectural Technology at FAMU

The 1983 report prematurely predicted the early demise of this program. All evidence at that time pointed to a program predating the new School of Architecture and had been overtaken by the new program. Little vitality, enthusiasm, or dedication was shown at the time of that review. The enrollment was reported in 1983 at 83 with only 17 graduates completing the program in the previous five years. The program now has approximately 60 students with the addition of an engineering technology program. The official BOR record showing the enrollment of 40 students in 1986 represents a continual decline since 1983. This decline is reported to be a decline primarily in foreign students who were attending FAMU. The new emphasis on management and an additional attention to computer education for training in estimating, programming, scheduling, and cost controls may suggest a title change to Construction Management. A diverse but experienced faculty at FAMU provides the instruction in the program, and a new director gives a positive sense of future to the program. Relationships are expected to be developed with the new Engineering School at FSU and stronger ties with the

industry in the panhandle area of the State.

The distinctions between the various technology programs seem slight and are limited to selection of certain courses. The program might be reinforced if it were combined back into one program meeting ABET standards for accreditation and focussing primarily on the construction management field with a strong computer technology content. There are no definite connections to the program in architecture, and the word "architecture" in the title is confusing to the student who sees another school of architecture in the adjacent building. Technical education is important to the construction industry and to the professions of engineering and architecture. It deserves the support and identity necessary to attract a qualified student wishing to enter the field and develop a successful career through a technical program.

Architectural Technology at FIU

At the time of the 1983 review this program was one of several technology programs centered in the College of Technology that were planned to become part of a proposed School of Building Sciences and Environmental Design. The review team at that time commended the faculty for this direction, but subsequent discussions led to the proposal for a School of Design requiring the transformation of the Technology program into an accredited program in Architecture or adding an accredited program to the Technology program. The concept of the School of Design that would be a unique response to the mission of FIU, its particular place in the Hispanic community, and the student body with their diverse ethnic backgrounds and "place-bound" attributes has been under serious discussion with the new

administration of the University.

The Dean of the College has been supportive of the development of the program as it moves towards establishing a professional program. However, changes in the senior level of the university administration have slowed the process and the resulting faculty attention has been directed towards the development of a four-year program adequate to allow transfer to graduate or five-year programs for an accredited degree in architecture to allow entry to the examination for licensure.

The technical areas of the program remain strong, with improvement in those sections of the program which overlap the program in Construction Management. Space remains a major and critical problem with studios and classrooms scattered across the campus. Student interest in the program shows a slight decline from 150 to 121 students. This is largely attributed by the faculty to the lack of decision on the professional program in architecture.

There is some faculty opinion that the Architectural Technology program should be maintained, in that it serves a large group of students and develops clear career opportunities in the Miami area. It is important to note that 68 of the 138 students registered in the program are Hispanic, 13 are black, and 34 are white. In the Construction Management program, which closely parallels the Architectural Technology program, the numbers are reversed, with 72 white students and 45 indicating a Hispanic background. Architecture is an important profession in the Hispanic culture, and the potential remains for a special program attentive to the needs of the Hispanic community in southern Florida and responsive to the family-oriented, job-bound student wishing to pursue a career in architecture.

INTERIOR DESIGN

There are three professional programs in interior design in the State, all of which existed at the time of the 1983 review. Each of these programs maintains strong professional connections and provides for a maximum of interaction between the academic programs and members of the interior design profession through visiting lecturers, part-time faculty appointments, and program advisory councils. It is interesting to note that each of the programs in the State is administered through a different organization. The FIU program resides in a Department of Construction, the UF program is located in a College of Architecture, and the FSU program is situated as a department in a School of Visual Arts. All three programs are primarily undergraduate programs. The only graduate program in the State in interior design is presently located at FSU.

Interior Design at UF

The program at UF has had several major improvements since the 1983 review of the state universities. The primary developments have been the departmental status given to the program in 1983 (under discussion at the time of the review) and the reaccreditation for a full five-year term in 1987. The appointment of a well-qualified chairman has greatly assisted the program in its organization, its professional focus, and its development for the future. Additional faculty lines and involvement in the total program of the College have moved the program away from its isolation within the College. Joint studios with architecture and participation in the lower division design program have given additional responsibility and recognition to the faculty.

The program limits its enrollment to the upper division in concert with the other design programs within the College. Approximately 30 students are accepted to the upper division each year, and the program has articulated its curriculum with the junior college programs at Miami-Dade and St. Petersburg to facilitate transfer students to the upper level of the design program at UF. Despite some fluctuations in the enrollment during the past several years, the program has continually attracted an adequate pool of applicants for its upper division courses.

The faculty recognizes that the emerging four-year program at FIU and the three-year program at Miami-Dade Jr. College may have an impact on the pool of students from the Miami area and expects through professional contacts, visitations, and events to maintain that important source of student interest. The program presently has 156 students, with 100 of those in the professional upper division.

The faculty in the program are giving attention to research activities, especially in the field of lighting. The faculty are also taking advantage of the College's new efforts in providing access to computer-aided design systems. The profession and the furniture industry is rapidly moving into computer based equipment schedules and office layouts. The CAD systems will be as important to the interior designer as to the engineer or architect of the future, and it is fortunate that the College has made the commitment to computer laboratories.

The small town location of the program shares the same difficulty as architecture in maintaining urban connections. The students in the program do participate in college-wide travel programs in Nantucket, Rhode Island, and Vicenza, Italy, as well as department developed internships to provide

professional experience for the student. Twenty-eight interior design firms, primarily in the State, have participated in this intern program.

The program seems to recognize its strengths as well as its weaknesses. As part of a design program, it gains by the structured attitudes of design in architecture, landscape architecture, and planning. Its attention is given to professional development, focussing primarily on commercial interiors and interior space planning. Its weakness is in its location separate to a major urban center where the primary users of its services reside. Research efforts will be rewarded in the university community and provide the necessary credibility for the professional program. The program has made significant improvement since the 1983 visit and has a clear set of goals for its future.

Interior Design at FSU

This program in Interior Design is one of the largest programs in the country, with 266 majors in the undergraduate professional program and 34 graduate students. The program has maintained this level of enrollment over the five-year period since the 1983 review. The program clearly continues to attract a large number of students and has the confidence of the profession in the State, particularly in the northern and panhandle sections of the State. Its proximity to Atlanta and New Orleans as well as to the major cities of Florida places it geographically in the center of a circle of major users of its graduates.

It has received a positive accreditation report since the 1983 review and continues to provide a solid professional program with a faculty of seven full-time and five part-time members. This reduction from the 1983

review, due to a phased retirement of the chairwoman who, with the faculty, "against all odds brought a program to its current prominence," is compensated for by the increase in part-time faculty. Most of these part-time appointments are professionals in the local area who have continued to be involved with the program over several years. They are important to the program, in that they provide a strong relation to the local profession. The new Chairman of the Department has maintained an accredited program of quality with the limited resources available in terms of space and salaries allocated by the University.

Although the Department's student/faculty ratio of 25/1 is high, it is within an appropriate level to meet accreditation standards. It is surprising that a program that is able to attract a large number of majors should lose a faculty line with a retirement of a senior and dedicated leader in the Department and have a reduction in its full-time teaching staff even though there is an increase in the number of adjunct faculty. The program is extremely fortunate to have a faculty that is dedicated to the program, its students, and its university. After reviewing the salary scales, the heavy load of teaching assignments, and the conditions of the incredibly limited teaching facilities, one must applaud the faculty and conclude that the College and the University have not been able to give due attention to this program.

The competition for resources is particularly evident between the demands of the undergraduate and the graduate programs. This is one of the largest graduate programs in the country in this field, and yet it has few assigned workstations even for graduate students, much less for upper level undergraduates. The extension of the faculty time to accommodate the

requirements of the undergraduate teaching programs and to also allow adequate attention to the needs of individual graduate students remains a major problem for the Department.

The 1983 report concluded that physical facilities were a major problem, and nothing has been changed in the five-year period since that time to improve the conditions of the program. The concern for adequate studio and exhibit space was also noted in the most recent accreditation report. A theater program occupies a portion of the converted campus ministry building and, with the exception of permission to share some classroom space with other units in the School of Visual Arts, no additional space has been assigned to the Department. The Department has begun a "limited access" admissions beginning at the freshman level to focus on the problem of numbers of majors in the program. The Department does attract a large number of transfer students. It is important to note that 85 percent of its current enrollment transfers from the central part of the State and many are AA degree holders.

The increased quality of the program can be demonstrated in the number of design awards that the students have won in major competitions, and in the level of research activities by the faculty. Several faculty members have been successful at obtaining funded projects in research for publications. Another evidence of an increase in the activities of its faculty and students is in the participation of the program in the FSU center in Florence, Italy.

It is also important to note that several computer units have been purchased by the University in recognition of the growing necessity for computer graphics as an integral part of the education of the interior

designer. A limited number of terminals have been placed within the space allocated to the Department for student and faculty use, and additional units are planned for installation in the near future. A new course has been created within the Department to develop the students' understanding of this important new tool for the profession. These units, together with the donation of office furniture from supporting office equipment organizations, are the major physical improvements evident in the program. The lack of increased support from the School and University during a five-year period since the previous report and the recent accreditation report is disappointing to this reviewer. This program deserves greater support from the institution in recognition of its many academic and professional accomplishments.

Interior Design at FIU

This program is the most recently established of the three major programs in the State. As one of the parallel programs in the Construction Department, it suffers from a lack of professional identity within the institution. Shared with the Architectural Technology program, it has had the steady decline in enrollment over the past five years from 76 majors in Fall 1982 to its present enrollment of 56 majors in Fall 1987. This decline is surprising given the location of the program in one of the major design centers in the country and the large numbers of professionals located there. The program has created an advisory board composed of professional designers in the Miami area, and their assistance is imperative to the future development of the program and should assist in the recruitment of students from the region.

The Department has been fortunate to add two full-time faculty members who bring a sense of dedicated professionalism to the program, but the lack of studio space, basic design skills, and conceptual courses continue to inhibit and limit the quality of the program. As one might expect in a program allied with architecture, construction, and technology, the technical skills of the students are high, and they are able to perform well in the profession. The faculty of the program are working towards accreditation from FIDER, the accrediting arm of the profession with the assistance and advice of the advisory board to accomplish this goal in time for the first graduating class in 1988.

The close relation between this program and the Architecture Technology program points to the common problem of teaching design in a technical environment. The studio culture for the investigation of design issues is not the same as the scientific laboratory or even the drawing studio of an art program. The dedicated work space for the individual student creates a unique arena for the sharing of ideas, techniques, and information. Brief visits during scheduled hours cannot compensate for the interactive experience of the creative search in the studio. If the University wishes to have a program which is design oriented rather than technically oriented, space must be assigned to that purpose and appropriate to the activity. The University must recognize the uniqueness of design education and that it is not information transferred from faculty to student as in the lecture room, but rather an experiential activity requiring time, maturity, and continual academic and professional reinforcement. University, general education requirements limit the sequence of courses that can be allocated to design,

thereby limiting the quality. For these programs to achieve real quality, attention must be paid to the requirements for excellence.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

At the time of the 1983 review, the one accredited program in Landscape Architecture in the State was at UF. In 1986 the second program was authorized at FIU. The program at UF is an undergraduate program leading to the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture, while the new program at FIU is a graduate program leading to the Masters of Landscape Architecture. The BOR had intended the LA program at UF to assist in the development of the new program at FIU as FAMU had assisted in the foundation of the cooperative program at USF. The relation between FIU and UF never materialized, and the new LA graduate program at FIU is in its second year in 1988 and the LA graduate program at UF waits in the wings. Meanwhile, the School of Architecture at UM have been authorized by its board of trustees to initiate a program in Landscape Architecture.

For a State with diverse climates ranging from tropical to southern cotton fields and an extremely long coastal area, the issues of land management, ecological studies, unique plant materials, and environmental issues would make the study of landscape both popular and important to the future of the State. Faculty members in both programs reported an excess of job offerings for graduates of LA programs.

Landscape Architecture at UF

The 1983 review made only brief comment concerning this program, noting primarily the limited scale of studio design projects and the lack of

integrative activity with the other design programs in the College. The review expressed concern with the lack of evidence of recognition within the program of its unique geographical and climatic environment. Since that review there have been several major developments which indicate improvement in the program.

The first is the proposed graduate degree in landscape architecture with an expected enrollment of 20-25 students each year in the program. The four areas of concentration within the program will be growth management, conservation, development and design, and landscape management. Each of these areas offers the potential for research and investigation into problems unique to Florida. The graduate program is appropriate to the institution and brings the Landscape Architecture program into concert with the other professional programs within the College. There is an expressed perception by the faculty that this program does not receive its share of the support within the College; and as the program has expanded to the lower division and to the graduate level, it is clear that additional lines will be necessary to support the new program and that additional space will be required for studios.

The MLA program will initially be a two-year program for advanced professional education but will eventually become a first-professional degree for the student without a design background but with an undergraduate degree, thereby bringing it into direct competition with FIU's new graduate program.

The second area of improvement is the extension of the program in the undergraduate area. The faculty have joined with the interior design faculty for more involvement in the lower division design program, accepting

responsibility for the fourth term of the beginning program and creating a new broadbased survey course for the University. There is also evidence of shared studios with planning and foreign summer programs with architecture. There is overlap of areas with planning, and the two graduate programs should be able to develop significant joint research and teaching activities.

A third area of improvement is in the attention to computer-aided design, which is becoming significant in this field. The College facilities are an asset to the LA program, and the faculty expressed the hope that computers will become a part of all courses rather than a specialized course in a special room. One of the major challenges of the future of design education is to integrate the computer into the traditional teaching processes of the studio environment.

The enrollment at slightly over 100 majors has been steady during the five-year period. The selection system from the lower division at UF, while far from perfect, has maintained a consistent entering class at the junior level. The challenge of the future will be to maintain the quality of the undergraduate program with the possibility of competition from the new program at UM and to develop a significant graduate program with the additional competition from FIU. These two programs are located in the southern area of the State and position the programs differently, one to a national audience as a private school and the other to the place-bound student, thereby leaving the remainder of the State to the program at UF. In the State of Florida the preservation, the conservation, and the organization of the natural environment is critical to the delicate balance of the development of the land. It is as important today as it was in the 1983 review

which pointed to the importance of research and recognition of Florida's unique environment.

Landscape Architecture at FIU

The newest program in the State is located at FIU and was intended to be paired with a proposed graduate program in architecture. The new graduate program has 17 students under the direction of two full-time faculty and several part-time with 48 students taking classes in the program. There is vigorous leadership in the program, sensitive to the needs of the student and knowledgeable in the profession and in the region. The program is inappropriately, but temporarily isolated among the service buildings on the edge of the campus with studios and excellent computer facilities. The program combines students with design and non-design backgrounds into the same studio, thereby creating courses of individual instruction. This can be done now with limited enrollment, but may create problems as the program matures. The program is designed to be completed in three and one half years for non-design majors, but others can receive advanced placement in the program to complete it in two years. This is a standard arrangement for accredited graduate programs in Landscape Architecture. The "stand-alone" graduate program (no undergraduate program in LA) finds itself in an administrative as well as physical isolation from the other programs in the School. As pointed out in other new programs, it is essential to have the support systems of other programs, faculty, and students to establish the academic context for the new program. The limited number of students who are involved in a new program need other students in similar fields of study until the program can reach maturity and create its own student body and

corps of faculty. As courses are currently offered in the evening, this position of the newly developing program is critical. Almost adequate space has been allocated there; and, compared to the critical needs of architectural technology and interior design for studios space, the new program seems better endowed than its more senior partners in the Department.

BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

There were two programs in construction in the State in 1983, and both of those two programs have developed in the five-year period. The older program at UF continues its strong relationship with the construction industry, and the program at FIU has changed its orientation and title from Construction Technology to Construction Management, phasing out the former program. Both programs report a demand for graduates who have field experience, technical knowledge, and management skills. A particular requirement of the industry is knowledge and experience with computer technology. Both programs have made advances in developing the computational and graphic capabilities of their computer programs. With the growth of the State, the construction industry can be expected to continue to require qualified people to meet the competitive edge of the market, and the diversity of opportunities for graduates will continue to make these construction programs attractive for students.

Building Construction at UF

This program was established in 1935, making it one of the oldest in the country. It has maintained its prominence as one of the leading programs in the field. It received school status and initial accreditation

in 1976. Its student enrollment has remained steady, with a total of 377 majors in 1982 and 350 majors in 1987. The graduate program averages between 45 and 50 students, and entry remains highly competitive. Entry to the upper division also is competitive both within UF and for the transfer student from well articulated programs in the junior colleges. Approximately 60 percent to 70 percent of the students in the program begin their college experience elsewhere, transferring to UF at the junior level. A majority of the students come from Florida and, interestingly enough, 20 percent to 30 percent have completed the four-year architecture program. The program limits admission to the upper division to 60 students annually. This requires extra time for many students in lower division in preparation for entry.

This program has also moved into the computer age in an impressive way. The faculty have acquired personal computers for their use, and students have access to the College's computer center. Graduate students have completed theses on the computer and have developed computer programs for use in many courses. In addition to the increased use of the computer, the School has begun a program of video taping lectures for purposes of students' review.

The faculty is dedicated to scholarship and research and the School has maintained its level of productivity in the five year interval. Four of the faculty are enrolled in Ph.D. programs, and additional lines have been added to the program. The faculty is at the senior level, which was noted in the 1983 report, five faculty members are expected to retire in the next five years. However, the School reports that two positions remain to be filled and the search is underway for a new director of the School. There has been an increase in minority faculty, and there is attention to assisting the

minority students in the program through tutoring and scholarships. The organization of black students in construction has helped slow the attrition rate of minorities within the program.

The 1983 report cited the low salaries, the high work load, and the high productivity of the faculty. In a competitive market with a well-paying industry, the School must be able to attract and retain its faculty if it is to maintain its position of excellence in the field. There are problems of salary scales at the present, and the ability to secure qualified faculty now and in the future as replacements for retirements may become a major problem. The program continues to receive significant on-going contributions from the construction industry and must also receive increased support from the University and College.

There appear to be increased and appropriate connections between the faculty and other units of the College and the University. Programs in civil engineering and business are important to the construction industry, and strong ties should be maintained with those academic fields. The possibility of a minor is being discussed by the faculty, which would allow an area of depth to be developed by the student in the program. The autonomy of the School within the College has permitted it to develop its own path toward excellence, but this has separated it somewhat from the other programs in the College. There are signs that interactions are beginning to take place for the mutual benefit of all programs with a special potential in the research activities in the Department of Architecture and the new college-wide doctoral program.

Construction Management at FIU

Significant improvements in this program since the 1983 review are demonstrated in the approval of the new graduate program (M.S. in Construction Management) and the initial accreditation of the program in 1984 by ACCE. Both of these events point to the quality of the program and the dedication of the faculty to the development of a program responsive to the needs of the student and the industry. The diverse backgrounds of the faculty were noted in the 1983 report, and most of the faculty have remained with the program during the five-year period. One of the strengths that was cited at that time was the quality of the faculty and "the richness of curricular offerings despite a still very modest magnitude of operation." These strengths remain at the present time, and the faculty recognizes the characteristics of its job-oriented student body. Many of the courses are offered in the evening or late afternoon to accommodate the working schedules of the students.

The title change from Construction Technology to Construction Management is an important distinction for the program. Additional connections to accounting and business have been made by the program. The attention to the management aspects of the construction process is moving the educational base from the "hammer and saw" nature of the vocational programs in building construction to the more sophisticated processes of business management as reflected in the industry itself. The close relation between the faculty and the construction industry in the Miami area helps to maintain the relevency of the program, and the close relation between the student at the job who is also the student in the classroom brings a currency to the program.

The computer has become a part of the program, with courses in estimating and cost control now being taught with computer programs. The faculty continue to involve the computer in research and instruction but are limited by student access for individual assignments. A microcomputer laboratory has been developed by the School, and the software support is available for many courses. The University is attempting to meet computer needs of the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences in all its fields of study, which seems particularly critical in this program.

The new graduate program should add depth to the program even though it may be a new demand on the program without additional resources to support it. The faculty indicated that no additional positions were being allocated to support the new program. The accrediting team recommended that the graduate program wait until the undergraduate program was strengthened. The faculty have addressed many of the curricula concerns of the accrediting report, but the primary problems of space and resources remain critical as reflected in all of the programs under this review at FIU.

URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING

The State of Florida is currently served by three accredited programs, two of which are in state supported universities (FSU and UF) and one in the privately supported school at UM. Prior to the site visit of current review, a fourth program was announced by FAU and located on the Boca Raton campus with extensions in the Ft. Lauderdale center in connection with the FIU/FAU Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems. As the problems of declining student enrollments continue to plague all of the existing programs in planning, it is surprising that the BOR has approved the fourth

program in the State (third state supported). The rapid growth of the State and the complicated problems of policy development and land planning controls are critical to the proper processes of development in the State. The public attention to planning issues and the visibility in the public press would point to a major interest in planning as a profession, and increased support for student scholarships and graduate awards would serve to encourage a larger pool of applicants to the existing graduate programs.

The three programs are positions with apparent territories identified. FSU has proximity to the state capital and interaction with the state agencies; while UF, as part of its land-grant mission, provides extension services with local government in community planning and development in the central part of the State. The program at UM has concerned itself with the physical development of the metropolitan area of Miami and the urbanization of southern Florida. All programs announce that they extend into the Caribbean basin and Latin America for service and research.

Planning programs vary according to their academic settings and are divided simplistically between policy and physical planning, although this distinction has become less clear in recent years. The FSU program is a department in the College of Social Science, whereas the programs at UF and UM are closely related to programs in architecture. The new program at FAU is emerging from support in the Departments of Economics and Geography in the College of Social Science.

The Florida Center for Urban Design and Research as a new element in the Florida scene is the recent creation of the BOR. This new center is located in Tampa and encourages participation with all the academic programs in planning, architecture, and landscape architecture. Although it does not

offer courses itself, the director and staff have tenured positions on the faculty at USF for the new program in architecture in Tampa. One of the original mandates of the center was to provide an urban window for the academic programs located in smaller communities in the State. This connection to the four academic programs of the State will be developed through an advisory board parallel to another public board that will jointly oversee the activities of the new center.

This new center has acquired a qualified staff and has sought sponsored projects that would aid the physical growth and development of the State. Internships for graduate students were offered to the state graduate programs in planning and architecture as well as several major programs in universities outside the State during the summer. Several faculty members from the different schools in the State have participated in some of the initial projects of the center. The tripartite goals of public service, applied research, and educational programs are articulated with "the unique mission of promoting urban design and architectural values as key." Important relationships must be developed with the senior academic institutions within the State as the center addresses the challenges of its ambitious goals for the future. It is premature to judge the future of this new undertaking at this time, but additional basic support to encourage university interaction is clearly critical to its success.

As basic funding is for support of the core staff with operating funds to be developed from the sponsored projects, the success of the center will be in its ability to attract significant attention and credibility within the power structure of the cities and State. In several ways the activities of the center compete with the various institutions of architecture and

planning within the State which are also seeking sponsored projects for faculty research and service. The objective nature of the Florida Center and its ability to organize teams of expertise to address problems and opportunities of the State may be its greatest asset. In discussion with deans and chairmen of the various programs in the State concerning the new center and the potential of their relationship, most voiced cautious but tacit support with a basic "wait-and-see" attitude. This center is an innovative addition to the programs of the State, and the rapidly developing problems of the State require a major step such as the creation of a very special place.

Planning at FSU

The FSU program has the distinction of being the first program in planning to be established in the State (1965) and offers the only Ph.D. in planning, which was authorized in 1974. The program has developed an excellent national reputation, often being placed in the second tier of planning programs behind the national leaders of MIT, Berkeley, UCLA, Pennsylvania, and Cornell. In addition to its basic Masters level and Ph.D. program, it offers an advanced undergraduate program. This program was developed partly to offset the declining enrollments of the 1970's and partly to promote interest among the undergraduates to consider planning as a career.

At the time of the last review the Department reported a faculty component of ten full-time members and three part-time members. The 1987 self study states that the faculty has nine full-time, two part-time, one visiting, and five adjunct members. The visitor's line was previously assigned

as a full-time member and is now used to attract temporary lecturers to the program to address the areas of land use planning and design. The program has several strong relationships within the College of Social Sciences including the Center for the Study of Population and the Center for Gerontology but only a speaking relationship with FAMU's School of Architecture. Since the last review there have been five new appointments to the faculty. The qualifications of the faculty are excellent and the production of research and publications has increased significantly. Faculty research is clearly emphasized in the Department. There is now a need for additional positions to accommodate the large number of undergraduate non-majors now being taught. The commitment to involvement with state agencies, service outreach to major cities in the State, together with teaching and individual research, requires a dedicated faculty. The program is very fortunate to have the opportunity to make an unusually large number of appointments in the recent years, and the result has been a rebuilding of the program since the last review.

The enrollment has apparently now stabilized with an average of 70 students in the graduate program each year. An additional Masters programs is offered in Tampa with 20 students currently enrolled. This program has been offered for several years and is a successor to the Orlando program reported in the 1983 review. This professional program is seen as an asset by the faculty but a drain on energy, time, and resources. It is interesting to note that the number of students entering the program at Tallahassee each year is equal to the total number of students enrolled in the Tampa program. The students are largely "place-bound" in the Tampa bay area but are highly motivated and challenging.

The faculty indicate that, contrary to national trends, 70 percent of their graduates are going into public service while 30 percent are entering the private sector. While the M.S. program has maintained its enrollment since the last review, there is clearly the opportunity to increase the numbers in that program if competitive funding for graduate support was made available. The Ph.D. program with ten students currently involved could increase slightly, but the quality and size of the pool remains a major problem for the program.

The program has access to the computer facilities of the College, and many courses require computer work. Only 30 percent of the students have had significant experience with mini-computers prior to entering the graduate program. Therefore, remedial work is necessary to provide a working capability with computers. Faculty members are allocated individual computers to assist their research and publications.

Additional graduate student support is needed to attract quality students to the program and additional faculty specifically in transportation to complete the five options of the Master's program. The needs of the program are clear, the quality is evident, and the accomplishments are visable. FSU should recognize the excellence of this program and provide a graduate support level equal to its potential.

Planning at UF

The graduate program in planning at UF had been established for only eight years at the time of the 1983 review. The stated emphasis of the program has shifted to the physical realm of the natural and community environments. As a unit of the College of Architecture, the program

participates in a broad range of activities, and as a unit of UF there are important connections to other sections of the University. The Department has a faculty component of 5 1/2 positions and student enrollment of 50 students. The 1983 report indicated a student population of 48 with a faculty of seven full-time positions. The Department has therefore maintained its student enrollment but decreased in the size of the faculty.

The increase in research has been impressive since the last review. The 1983 level was between $30,000 and $40,000 annually, and the present level is approximately $300,000. This is a result of several factors, including the new emphasis in the College on research, several new appointments and primarily the IBM support for the Geo-facilities, Planning and Information Research Center now being installed in the College. This impressive project will significantly increase the research capacity of the faculty and bring attention to the program.

In a similar way, the proposed doctoral program will have a significant impact on the program in attracting qualified candidates, participating in research efforts, and developing a level of planning activity that the program has been unable to accommodate. Although the proposed program is college wide, the faculty in this Department will have a major role in its development. The current chairman of the Department has already been assigned as director of the doctoral program.

The faculty have extended the program within the University and the College in formal ways such as the joint studio in design with the graduate program in architecture and the connections with the Department of Real Estate and Finance to offer minor concentrations in each others' programs. The college-wide Center for Community Redevelopment is also located in the

Department, and the development of an environmental planning track within the planning curriculum has attracted an increasing number of students. Most of the applicants to the program are alumni of the UF, and 40 percent come from south Florida to the program. The faculty have considered a request for a graduate degree program at the University of North Florida. This would provide the faculty with a window in the Jacksonville area which could become an important development for the future of the program.

Planning at UM

The planning program at UM is also a recent development, having been initiated in 1973 as a unit within the Department of Architecture and now School of Architecture. The program has a director, the required minimum faculty (5) for accredition, and a present graduate component of 30 students, of which at least one half are in the new MURP/MBA program. The 1983 review indicated that there were eight students in the program, and several accreditation reports indicate the small enrollment in the program. The faculty report that there were 30 applications for the planning program last year, and 15 were accepted. The new combined program has obviously provided new life for the graduate program in planning. The courses in the new MURP/MBA are offered on weekends and the program is designed to attract mid-career candidates who wish to continue their education while holding a responsible position in the Miami area. Many of these students are working in an area of the field of planning in either the public or private sector. This type of program is a direct response to the urban setting of the program.

The problems of enrollment in this program have remained since the last review, and questions of continuance were raised during the 1985 accrediting visit. The inability of the program in a major world-class city to attract a large pool of applicants to a career in planning remains a question without a clear answer. The faculty is of high quality and is experienced in the field, recognized in the profession and in the city, and dedicated to the program at UM. All five of the positions are held by faculty with long tenure at UM. It is beyond the scope of this report to focus on the issues that are raised concerning the enrollment in the program, but if the past year is evidence, there are limited signs of improvement for the future.

The program should benefit from the separation of the School of Architecture from the College of Engineering. The increased visibility of the program in architecture in the community and among the undergraduate programs in the country should assist in increasing the pool of applicants. The faculty should be able to identify internships and scholarships to support graduate work in the program from agencies in the metropolitan area or from the private sector in land development and real estate to meet the cost of tuition and provide stipends. In discussions with the faculty in the program, there seems to be satisfaction with the new combined program and little promise for the MURP program. The faculty in architecture are placing priority on their graduate program, and so should planning.

Planning at FAU

This program in planning is the newest in the State and is still in the formative stages. It has been developed by a committee of the faculty mainly in the College of Social Science through the leadership of the

Chairmen of the Departments of Geography and Economics. The committee clearly understands graduate work, and most of them direct graduate students in their individual fields. The Dean of the College has a background in planning and the University administration is knowledgeable and supportive of the new program. The program is expressed as a logical extension of the undergraduate program in urban and regional studies at FAU, and the strong demand for advanced study from alumni of the University working in the field and from employers needing additional staff in their offices. The program also has the strong support of the FAU/FIU Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems located in Fort Lauderdale. This Center has been established since 1972 and focuses its work on sponsored research into the problems of growth management, primarily in the southern part of the State. It has been very supportive of the new program and assisted in the development of the proposals. The center will provide funded internships for the program, and two endowed chairs have already been designated for the new program. An adjacent computer lab is available.

The growth of the southeastern region of the State has made planning important, and significant attention is directed towards careful organization of land development through local and regional jurisdictions. Although the existing planning schools should be able to supply the job market with adequate numbers and quality of graduates, the committee believes that a new program at FAU can meet the needs of older students, place-bound with family and job who wish to advance their careers or seek new career opportunities.

The program has had professional reviews and appears prepared to select its first class. Enrollment targets indicate that the beginning class will

be limited to 21 students divided equally between alumni of FAU, alumni of other Florida universities, and employees in agencies in the immediate area. The anticipated five-year projection shows the figure of 58 students enrolled. In view of the enrollment patterns in the other programs in planning in the State of Florida, it is clear that this is an ambitious target. Given the localized pool of expected applicants, it must be questioned whether this pool is adequate to continue to supply candidates. A program developed by a well qualified faculty, encouraged by a research center, supported by its university, and located in a major population area: it just may succeed.

Special Footnotes to the Program Evaluations

It should be recognized that there are several newly established programs visited during this review. The difficulty of academic predictions points to the importance of continual review by professional and institutional committees. The new cooperative FAMU/FSU program, the new graduate planning program at FAU, and the graduate Landscape Architecture program at FIU will bear close evaluation during their initial years of development. The accreditation requirements for the FAMU/FSU program, the design programs at FIU, and the proposed B.Arch. program at UF may have a major impact on those programs. Although all programs attract students from throughout the country and from abroad, particularly the Caribbean areas, the physical location at the corner of the USA gives it an isolated location from which to draw students from out of the State. The primary source of students will always be within the State, and therefore the programs will remain highly competitive for the best and brightest applicants for their program. Clear

articulation to the uniqueness of the individual programs is needed with goals and intentions clearly stated. While the state institutions of higher learning seem to have difficulty in joint or cooperative programs, they seem to do well at competition. The Florida Center in Tampa or the Research Center in Fort Lauderdale offer non-territorial arenas for development and interaction between the institutions. The growth of the State during recent times points to the opportunities for research and extension of the academic programs in the professions concerned with the changing environments of the natural and man-made worlds. The challenge of the academic programs is to maintain credibility in both the changing professions and the evolving universities within a rapidly changing society.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are prepared for the improvement of the individual programs as part of this review of the state universities and the University of Miami. While the limitations of time prohibited an in-depth report on each program, the discussions with faculty and administrations of most programs provided a sense of the place, programs, and faculty. Except for brief discussions at FAMU/FSU Architecture, UF graduate Architecture, FSU Interior Design, and FIU graduate Landscape Architecture, there was little imput from students in the various programs, and only in a few cases (FSU planning) was there an opportunity to review the program with alumni or employees of recent graduates. Although this was not a required item on the agenda, it would have been helpful to have provided a better balanced view of the programs. Each of the programs submitted self studies for accreditation reviews and their subsequent reports. Most of these reports

contain recommendations which have been reviewed by the faculty of the program and by the administration of the university. In reviewing those reports for the BOR review, one becomes aware of the large number of recommendations made by external committees for the improvement of the programs. This set of recommendations is offered in the same light, for consideration by the faculty, the administration, and the Board of Regents.

University of Florida

1. While the addition of interior design and landscape architecture faculty have been added to the lower division of design at UF to participate in the design courses, there should be a more equitable presentation of career choices to all students in that division and processes of student selection than presently exists. It is recommended that equal attention be given to all fields in the College that are dependent on the lower division of design courses in the orientation programs for students.
2. The programs of Landscape Architecture and Interior Design seemed "stretched" to accommodate their professional requirements in the junior and senior years with the added responsibility to the lower division courses. It is recommended that a more in-depth review of faculty teaching loads between architecture, landscape architecture, interior design for the lower division be developed.
3. It is apparent that the program in Landscape Architecture has improved since the last review. It is recommended the necessary recources be developed to support the implementation of a graduate program in

Landscape Architecture with a stated relation to the graduate programs in architecture and planning.

4. The initial research efforts of the program in Interior Design are important for the credibility of the program, the development of the faculty, and the integration with the other programs of the College. It is recommended that these initial efforts should be supported by advance funding from the administration of the College and University.

5. The new research efforts of the program in planning are impressive; however it is unclear as to the relation of these new developments to the degree program in planning. It is recommended that careful articulation be developed between the Master's program and the research program.

6. The graduate program in planning should continue the aggressive campaign for student recruitment with a sharper focus to its program. It is recommended that additional funding for graduate stipends be developed to support the new research program and the college-wide Ph.D. program.

7. The program in Architecture has a large number of graduates completing the non-professional undergraduate program and a small number (proportionally) completing the first-professional graduate program. It is recommended that the faculty develop a program that will provide the State with a larger number of professional graduates.

8. There seems to be a greater spirit of cooperation between the departments of the College and more attempts to combine studio activities and off-campus study programs. It is recommended that the faculty continue to search for integrative programs of mutual support and interest.

9. The program in Building Construction should develop a plan of faculty recruitment as retirements and reassignments become evident. It is recommended that the faculty give close attention to the needs and funding of the teaching program and future staffing of the courses.

10. In recognition of the present space problems within the College, it is recommended that the College in concert with the University develop a long range facility improvement plan to accommodate a growing research program and the already crowded design program of the College.

Florida State University

1. The faculty and chairman of the program in Interior Design should develop a long range plan of facility improvement to accommodate the physical needs of this design program. Although there has been no major increase in space allocation, neither has there been a presentation to the reviewer of clear articulation of the space requirements. It is recommended that the faculty in concert with the College develop and present to the administration a stated program of the physical requirements of the Department.

2. Although the program in Interior Design is making some attempt to reduce the number of majors by reducing the number of entering students, it should also raise the level of the performance requirements in the program to assure a high quality major. It is recommended that the faculty review the standards for student performance towards an increased rigor in professional courses.

3. The quality of the graduate planning program is impressive, but there continues to be a need for an increase in the pool of applicants and an

increase in the support level to attract quality students to the program. It is recommended that the program compete in the national arena through vigorous recruitment with an increased graduate support level.

4. There is a clear need for a faculty member in the area of transportation, and it is recommended that some combination of funding (with engineering) be made available.

5. Even recognizing the difficulties of cooperative programs, the faculties in planning and interior design should both develop stronger connections to the program in architecture at FAMU. In recognition of the physical proximity. It is still recommended, as it was in the 1983 report, that the three programs give special attention to the development of mutually supportive curricula and research programs.

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University

1. The programs in Architectural Technology and Construction should combine the various programs and define the goals and intentions for the prospective students to the University. It is recommended that the programs in this area be combined and defined with a title appropriate to its mission and separate to the accredited program in architecture.

2. While the School of Architecture provides multiple entry and exit points, it has become a complicated arrangement of degree programs (at least to this reviewer). It is recommended that the program provide a clearer definition of paths through the curriculum. There is greater strength in offering a few strong programs than attempting to attract students by offering many combinations of programs.

3. With the shifting arrangements of professional programs in architecture in the State, there is an understandable nervousness about the pool of future applicants to the program. It is recommended that the School initiate a study of its image, its potential marketplace for applicants, and its relation to the junior college programs of the State towards an advanced program of focussed student recruitment.

4. Although the building is a new facility, several comments were made during the site visit to support the case for a post occupancy evaluation of its fitness to the current teaching program. It is recommended that a faculty committee review the building and prepare a statement of needed improvements for consideration by the University administration.

5. The FAMU/FSU cooperative program in Tampa requires attention to its administrative structure. It is recommended that an agreement be developed between the two universities and BOR with clear lines of authority for program development and review, budget management, and faculty appointments. Although the current director of that program holds a position in the FAMU School of Architecture, his proximity to USF seems to complicate the statements of the administration of the new program. (see the section on FSU)

University of South Florida

1. As noted above, the responsibility of USF to the cooperative program in architecture as the "host" institution is unclear. This is especially true as two of the faculty (Crane and Bennett) hold tenure at USF, whereas the authority for the program lies at FAMU. The above recommendation (No. 19) is equally valid for this University.

2. Although the administrative responsibility for the program must be clarified first, the physical location of the new program places it in an isolated position from the University and from the city. It is strongly recommended that the program be relocated even temporarily to an appropriate place more supportive either of its academic intentions or its professional purposes. This new cooperative venture demands greater visability and participation in the programs of the University and in the city.

Florida Atlantic University

1. The proposed graduate program in planning has strong academic support; but, despite assurances from the faculty to the contrawise, the maintenance of a continual pool of quality applicants is problematical. While the immediate area may provide an initial class of students, the continuance is questionable. It is recommended that the faculty development committee continue to review the program towards sharpening its focus and intentions, and defining its uniqueness among the underpopulated planning programs of the State to attract a larger applicant pool.
2. Especially critical to the success of the new planning program will be its developing relation with the FAU/FIU Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems in Fort Lauderdale. It is recommended that the Center with its two supporting universities articulate the special arrangements for student internships and research potential and promote both the academic and the service components of the program.

3. The University and the Center should seek special funding to support graduate stipends in order to attract applicants from a broader region. The program may become too provincial and narrowly defined by its student component unless there is participation by students from diverse backgrounds and experiences. It is recommended that the University seek additional funding for graduate student support to compete in the national marketplace.

Florida International University

1. In recognition of the special place in south Florida and the student body, the diverse design programs in the College of Engineering and Applied Science have the potential to serve an important role in professional education in the region. To prepare for this role it is recommended that the University develop a comprehensive "grand plan" with annual budget increments, enrollment predictions, and faculty requirements for consideration by the BOR.
2. The design programs require dedicated space in order to reach an acceptable level of student performance. It is recommended that a facility program be developed to state the needs of the various programs in Architectural Technology, Interior Design, Landscape Architecture, and Construction Management. There are specific guidelines for programming such facilities, utilizing appropriate data and national norms of design schools.
3. The current close proximity between the programs of Construction, Interior Design, and Architecture Technology with a slightly distant program in Landscape Architecture offer the potential for close

interaction between programs. It is recommended that the commonality of these programs be articulated and developed for the mutual benefit of all programs.

4. The program in Construction Management has initiated a new graduate program. It is recommended that special attention be given to the selection and performance of the first class of students to establish a high standard of performance.
5. The new graduate program in Landscape Architecture is well served with temporary space and good computer facilities. It is recommended that the program be moved as quickly as possible into a closer physical relationship with the other design programs.
6. Although the programs have been well shepherded by the Dean of the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences, it may be appropriate to consider separating the design programs into a new administrative structure. It is recommended that the University administration appoint a committee to review the current program structure and make appropriate recommendations for consideration by the University.
7. The University has long given attention to "place-bound" students and the "work-bound" schedules of students. It is recommended that innovative schedules and programs continue to address the needs of the working students.

The Florida Center for Urban Design and Research

1. Although the Center has selected its initial staff and several projects are underway, the relation of the Center to the universities remains marginal. It is recommended that the two proposed policy boards be

appointed and delegated appropriate authority for the review of the activities, the projections, and the interface between the academic programs of the State in providing an "urban window" for these professional programs of the State.

2. The initial funding for the Center has limited its ability to attract participation from the architecture and planning programs of the State. It is recommended that the BOR provide additional funding for graduate stipends, faculty participation, and program support.

3. As the several planning programs in the State seem to be underenrolled, there may be an opportunity for temporary reassignment of faculty to the Center for greater interaction. It is recommended that the BOR review this possibility with the appropriate institutions. As the planning program at FSU offers a degree program in Tampa and the Center has a stated mission to education, it is recommended that FSU be invited to join the participating universities as a full member in the educational policy board of the Florida Center.

University of Miami

1. The MURP planning program has marginal enrollment and, although new programs are being developed to attract a special student, its future continues to be questionable. Unless new and major efforts are made, it is recommended that the planning program be phased out and the resources be placed toward the graduate program in Architecture.

2. The authorization of a program in Landscape Architecture and the development of an interior program should move slowly and cautiously so as to avoid the diversion of limited resources from the program in Architecture. It is recommended that the faculty review these parallel

programs and evaluate the cost and advantage of each including faculty and space requirements. It may be better to focus on the quality of one program than diffuse the thrust of the School with multiple directions of development.

3. The School has placed itself in an excellent position in the design world at the national level and is beginning to attract attention in the international arena. It is recommended that the faculty continue their aggressive development of the program to continue to extend the visibility of the School, attract attention to its programs, and to continue to bring to the campus major figures in the field of architecture and design.

4. With the increase in applicants who wish to begin at the first-year level, and a decrease in the number of transfer students for mid-level entry, the faculty may wish to strengthen the design sequence for greater continuity. It is recommended that the curriculum in architecture be organized for the primary arrangement of sequential courses in the five-year sequence. Preference should be given to beginning students. This would eventually improve the quality of the upper-level work.

General Recommendations

1. The recent organization of the administrative heads of the programs in architecture is an important collective voice to address problems of mutual concern in the State. It is recommended that this organization continue its meetings on a regular schedule and that the BOR, the State

Board for Architecture, and the state AIA recognize the importance of the group to the future of the profession in the State.

2. One final observation is that the evolution of the many programs during the past five years has not brought a sharpening of focus to the programs but rather a diffusion and an attempt to offer multiple choices to the student. It is recommended that the individual faculties review their programs in order to articulate and implement a clearer direction.

APPENDIX A

SITE VISIT SCHEDULE

Note: all meetings were attended by Dean William McMinn, BOR consultant, and Dr. Angela Lupo-Anderson of the BOR office.

Florida A & M University		January 11, 1988
Monday		
9-9:15am	Orientation	Dean Ots, D. Young (BOR)
9:15-11:30am	Review of Technology	Dean Kidd, Faculty
11:30-12:00	Mtg. w/FAMU Administration	VP Hogg,
12:00-12:30pm	Working Lunch	Hogg, Kidd, Ots
12:30-1:00pm	Tour of new Facilities	Dean Ots,
1:00-2:30pm	Review of Issues Dean Search SOA Management	Dean Ots, Asst. Dean Peterson, Judy McCalman
2:30-4:00pm	Review of Program	Dean Ots,

Florida State University		January 12, 1988
Tuesday		
8:00-8:30am	Interior Design Facility Curriculum/ Resources; Admissions/ Retention Articulation	David M. Butler
8:30-8:50am	Facility Tour	Lisa Waxman, Charles Dykes
9:00-9:30am	Interviews w/faculty	Peter Munton, Karen Myers
9:30-10:00am	Interviews w/students	ASID Student Chapter Ofcrs. & Selected Undergraduates
10:00-10:30am	Interviews	Graduate Students

10:30-11:00am	Orientation Slide Series	David Butler, Tock Ohazama
11:00-11:30am	Program Review Goals	Jerry Draper, Dean
11:30-12:00	Final Consultation/Review	Butler, Peter Munton
12:00-1:30pm	Lunch	VP Turnbull
1:30-2:30pm	City and Regional Planning	Program Faculty
2:30-3:15pm	Meeting with	Student Reps, 1st, 2nd, & Doctoral Years
3:15-3:45pm	Meeting with	Dean Cnudde
3:45-4:45pm	Meeting with	Alumni/Employer's Reps
4:45-5:15pm	Meeting with and Tour Facility	Chairman

University of Florida — January 13, 1988

Wednesday

8:00-9:00am	Breakfast	Catanese, Crain, Schneider
9:00-9:30am	Building Construction Discussion of Program and 15 year Plan	Building Const. Faculty & EPPS
9:30-10:00am	Review of BCN Display	Faculty
10:00-10:30am	Interaction	Dr. Cox/Graduate Faculty
10:30-11:00am	Interaction	BCN Students
11:00-12:30am	Tour BCN Facility	Faculty
12:00-1:00pm	Lunch	BCN Faculty/Guests
1:00-2:00pm	Interior Design Overview of Progress since Last Review	Interior Design Faculty & Students
2:00-2:45pm	Review of Adm. Changes	Prof. Nielson
3:00-3:45pm	Meeting with	Provost Bryan
4:00-5:00pm	Walking Tour of Int. Design	Faculty

facilities/Continued
Discussions

University of Florida (Continued)		January 14, 1988
Thursday		
8:00-9:15am	Breakfast	White, Dasta, Gundersen
9:15-10:00am	Architecture Update on Undergraduate Program, Exhibit	Prof. Gundersen
10:00-10:30am	Gen. Grad. Program Review and Update	Profs. Ridgdill & Dasta
10:30-11:15am	Presentations (15 min. ea.)	Haase, Siebein, Morgan
11:15-11:45am	Presentation-Grad. Des. Studio	Rumpel and Merritt
11:45-12:00pm	Exit Review	Ridgdill
12:00	Landscape Architecture Working Lunch Review of Dept. Response	Department Faculty Prof. Smith
12:30-1:15pm	Master of LArch Program	Smith & Donelin
1:15-1:45pm	Review of Faculty Research	Donelin, Grist, Williams, Linscott
1:45-2:00pm	Review of Dept. Goals/Needs	Faculty
2:00-4:00pm	Planning Discussion of Dept. of Urban and Regional Planning	Profs. Starnes, Bartley, Nicholas, Alexander

Florida Center for Urban Design & Research		January 15, 1988
Friday		
8:00-9:00am	Breakfast	David A. Crane, Director
9:00-9:15am	Travel to Center	
9:15-10:30am	Review of Current Program	Core Staff/Graduate Interns

10:30-11:15am	Discussion of General Operating Issues/Plans	Crane, Bennett
11:15-11:30am	Travel to USF Campus	
11:30-2:00pm	FAMU/FSU Cooperative Prog. in Arch. Facility	Alexander Ratensky, Dir.
2:00-3:00pm	Research/Community Proj.	Keith Grey, Tom Pugh
3:00-4:00pm	Design/Related Curriculum	Deans Ots, Stone, Ratensky White, Grey, Alfano, Calderon
4:00-4:30pm	Review FAMU/USF Program	Deans Ots, Mann, Peterson, Martineau
4:30-5:00pm	Wrap-up	Dean Ots, Young

University of Miami — January 18, 1988

Monday

9:00-9:30am	Introductions	Dean Regan/Faculty
9:30-10:30am	Changes in Development	Regan/Faculty
10:30-11:30am	New Programs Since '82	Regan/Faculty
11:30-12:30pm	Academic Connectives	Regan/Faculty
12:30-1:30pm	Discussion Luncheon	
1:30-2:30pm	Professional Programs/Extension Programs Since '82	Regan/Faculty
2:30-3:30pm	Academic Connections Since '82	Regan/Faculty
3:30-4:30pm	Enrollment, Applications, Distribution, Quality of Students	Regan/Faculty
4:30-5:00pm	Faculty Plans	Regan/Faculty
5:00-5:30pm	Directions for the Future	Regan/Faculty

Florida International University		January 20, 1988
Wednesday		
8:30-9:00am	Meeting with	Prof. Johnson
9:00-10:00am	Meeting with	Pres. Maidique
10:00-11:00am 11:00-12:00pm	Meeting with Landscape Arch	Dean Hopkins, Engineering Leo Alvarez
12:00-1:30pm	Lunch	Johnson
1:30-3:00pm	Construction Management Interior Design Architecture	Chaudaii Gisela-Mata Vivian Johnson
4:00	Wrap-up	Johnson

Florida Atlantic University		January 20, 1988
Wednesday		
9:15-10:00am	Meeting with	Drs. Schultz, Stronge, Tata, Latham, DeGrove
10:00-10:30am	Meeting with	Dr. Leonard Berry, Pres. Dr. Jeffrey Tennant, Assoc. VP/Dean of Grad Studies
10:30-11:30am	Tour of Library/Comp. Ctr.	Nancy Wynen William King
11:30-12:00pm	Meeting with	Dr. Robert A. Catlin, Dean of Social Science
12:00pm	Lunch/Travel to Broward Tower	
1:15-2:00pm	Tour of Tower Facilities	Dr. James Sycamore, Provost of Broward
2:00-2:30pm	Meeting with	Dr. Lance-DeHaven-Smith
2:30pm	End Formal Schedule	

APPENDIX B

ARCHITECTURE PROGRAM REVIEW
UNIVERSITY COORDINATORS

Dr. Anthony Catanese
Department of Architecture
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611

Dr. Richard Smith
Department of Urban & Regional Planning
355 Bellamy Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Dr. Enn Ots
School of Architecture
Florida A & M University
Tallahassee, Florida 32307

Dr. Alexander Ratensky
FAMU/USF Cooperative Architecture Program
10770 North 46th Street, Suite A800
Tampa, Florida 36617

Dr. Ron Schultz
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Florida 33432

Dr. Ralph Johnson
Department of Construction
University Park Campus
Florida International University
Miami, Florida 33199

Dr. David Crane
Center for Urban Design and Research
University of South Florida
100 W. Kennedy Blvd.
Tampa, Florida 33620

APPENDIX C

WILLIAM G. McMINN

Dean
College of Architecture, Art and Planning
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853

Education:

Rice University, Houston, Texas
- Bachelor of Arts 1951
- Bachelor of Architecture 1953

University of Texas, Austin, Texas
- Master of Architecture 1954

Major Academic and Professional Honors:

Fellow, American Institute of Architects
Fellow, American Academy in Rome
Past President, National Architectural Accrediting Board
Past Director, Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture

Member, Advisory Council, School of Architecture, Rice University, Houston, Texas
Consultant to University of Jordan, School of Architecture, Amman, Jordan
Member, Advisory Consortium, University of Petroleum and Minerals, Dhahran, Saudi Arabia
Consultant to Mimar Sinan University, Department of Architecture, Istanbul, Turkey
Member, National AIA Honors Awards Jury, Reynolds Aluminum Competition Jury

Major Publications:

" L'Architectura Americana", with Pietro Mele (Photographer), Editalia (Anticipated date of publication, 1988)
"The Architects Handbook of Professional Practice", Vol I, Chapter 1.3, Education and Licensing, Handbook, AIA (1988)
"Architectural Education: NAAB Sets New Accrediting Rules for the Schools", Architectural Record, (March 1984)
"A New School for the Middle East", University of Jordan, (1979)

Research and Service:

Cornell University:

Member, Board of Directors, Herbert F. Johnson Museum of Art
Member, Architectural Review Committee, Board of Trustees
Member, Board of Governors, Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research (CISER)
Member, Advisory Board, Center for International Studies

Mississippi State:

First Dean, School of Architecture
Member, University Research Council
Advisor, Mississippi Board for Licensing of Architects
Director, Mississippi Industrial Development Foundation

Resume - William G. McMinn

Dean and Professor College of Architecture, Art & Planning Cornell University Ithaca, New York	1984 - present
Dean and Professor School of Architecture Mississippi State University Starksville, Mississippi	1974 - 1984
Head and Professor Department of Architecture Louisiana State University Baton Rouge, Louisiana	1971 - 1974
Director of Design Six Associates, Inc. Architects and Engineers Asheville, North Carolina	1968 - 1971
Head and Professor Department of Architecture Auburn University Auburn, Alabama	1965 - 1968
Assistant to the Dean and Professor School of Architecture and the Arts Auburn University Auburn, Alabama	1963 - 1965
Assistant Professor School of Architecture Clemson University Clemson, South Carolina	1959 - 1963
Assistant Campus Architect Texas Technological University Lubbock, Texas	1958 - 1959
Instructor Department of Architecture Texas Technological University Lubbock, Texas	1956 - 1958
Chief of Engineering Section U.S. Army Engineers Fort Bragg, North Carolina	1954 - 1956

Professional Registration for Architecture	Texas 1957 Alabama 1964

Honors, Involvements, and Consultancies

1988 Consultant to the Board of Regents, State University System of Florida for review of all programs in architecture, planning, interior design, construtiton, and landscape architecture.

1987 Participant, Invited Competition, "Taksim Square Competition" Istanbul, Turkey

Consultant to Portland State University for consideration of acquiring Oregon School of Design.

1985 Keynote speaker, University of Cinncinnati, President's faculty retreat, "Professional Education as a Liberal Art".

First American to visit the University of Baghdad and Baghdad Technical University in Iraq under the auspices of the newly reopened American Embassy.
Invited to return in 1986 for lecture series.

1983 Representative of the United States to an international symposium in Istanbul as part of the Mimar Sinan University's Centennial Celebration. Return visits in 1985 and 1987 for curriculum review and lecture series.

1981 Appointed to the U.S. University Consortium to advise the University of Petroleum and Minerals, Saudi Arabia. Annual visits to observe the development of the College of Environmental Design.

Appointed a Fellow, American Academy in Rome. (Mid-career fellowship)

Speaker, Governor's Conference on Education, Jackson, MS

1980 Elected as Fellow, American Institute of Architects

Program Speaker, ASA/AIA Student Forum, Philadelphia, PA

Coordinator of Facility Planning for MSU Creative Arts Complex 12,000,000 sq ft. facility for art, music, and drama

1979 Appointed by the U.S. State Department as Educational consultant to the University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan, to assist in the development of a new Department of Architecture.

1978 Public Advisory Member, Government Service Agency, Southeastern Region

Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture

1987 Speaker, "Development Strategies for Schools of Architecture", ACSA, Washington, DC

1986 Speaker, "Computers in the Education of the Architect" ACSA, Washington, DC

1985 Speaker, "Research in the Schools of Architecture", ACSA, Washington DC

1981 Speaker, First Annual ACSA Administrators Conference, Washington, DC

1978 Program Committee, Architect/Educator Conferences, ACSA Southeast Region and NCARB Southern Conference

ACSA Observer, NCARB Seminar on International Reciprocity

ACSA Observer, National Intern Development Program Committee

Moderator, Keynote Panel, ACSA Annual Meeting, Savannah, GA

1977 National Program Chairman, ACSA Annual Meeting, Tucson, AZ

1976 Co-Chairman, Joint Regional ACSA Meeting, Southeast and Southwest Regions, New Orleans, LA

1976-79 Elected Southeastern Regional Director, Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture to represent 21 schools in the Southeastern Region (ACSA)

National Architectural Accrediting Board

1988 Member, NAAB Accrediting Team: Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, RI

1987 Member, NAAB Accrediting Team: City College of New York, NY

1986 Member, NAAB Accrediting Team: University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN

1984-85 Chairman, NAAB Accrediting Team: University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA

1983 President, NAAB

Chairman, NAAB Accrediting Team:
Harvard University, Cambridge, MA
University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI

1982 Chairman, NAAB Accrediting Team:
Princeton University, Princeton, NJ
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA

1981 Chairman, NAAB Accrediting Team:
University of Colorado, Denver, CO
University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT
North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC
Howard University, Washington, DC

1980 Appointed to NAAB Board as representative of Schools of Architecture

Appointed to NCARB National Committee on Education

1979 Chairman, NAAB Accrediting Team, University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI

1978 Member, NAAB Accrediting Team, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA

1977 Member, NAAB Accrediting Team, University of Miami, Miami, FL

American Institute of Architects

1988 Chairman, Honor Awards Gulf States Region, Jury: John Burgee, Jim Polshek

1987 Chairman, Honor Awards Jury, Mississippi Chapter AIA
Jury: Earl Flansburgh, Michael McCarthy

1985 Member, Design Awards Jury, New York State Council of the AIA

1981 Member, Reynolds Aluminum Student Competition Jury

1979 Chairman, Honor Awards Jury, Mississippi Chapter AIA,
Jury: William Finch, Kemp Mooney, Joseph Amisano

Chairman, Honor Awards Jury, Birmingham, Alabama, Alabama Chapter AIA

Chairman, Honor Awards Jury, Mobile, Alabama, Alabama Chapter AIA

Member, Design Jury, State of Tennessee Competition for State Pavilion

Member, AIA National Honor Award Jury for Extended Use

1978 Chairman, Honor Awards Jury, Gulf States Regional AIA
Jury: Thomas Ventulett, William Marlin, William Morgan

1977 Chairman, Honor Awards Jury, Mississippi Chapter AIA
Jury: Harry Wolf, William McGehee, Charles Hight

1976 Chairman, Honor Awards Jury, Mississippi Chapter AIA
Jury: Jack Train, Stanley Tigerman, Dick Whitaker

American Institute of Architects - continued

1975 Chairman, Honor Awards Jury, Mississippi Chapter AIA
Jury: Harlan McClure, Sam Hurst, Jim Ellison

1970 Honor Awards Recipient, North Carolina State Chapter AIA

Miscellaneous

1981 Downtown Redevelopment Charrette for Richmond, VA, involving New York University and Mississippi State University (NEA Funded)

1977 Consultant for the School of Architecture, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, Tallahassee, FL

Professional Advisor, Design Competition, Fire Station Number 3, Starksville, MS

Professional Advisor, Design Competition, Chamber of Commerce, Greenville, MS

1976 Recipient, National Endowment Grant of $10,000 for "Circuit Rider" concept to assist in the development of small towns

1974 Adjunct Member of the Mississippi State Board of the Licensing of Architects

Coordinator, Biloxi Design Festival to focus on design for library in Biloxi and involved six schools of architecture and six nationally known architects for an intensive design workshop (NEA Funded)

1972 Consultant to State of Louisiana for State Facilities Utilization Study of State Properties and Buildings

Professional Advisor, Design Competition, Gulf South Research Institute, Baton Rouge, LA

1971 Consultant to Louisiana Legislature for Study of State Capitol towards providing additional space for legislative office space (study presented to Legislature at 1972 session)

1970 Professional Advisor, Design Competition, School of Art and Architecture, Southwestern Louisiana University, Lafayette, LA

APPENDIX D

ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAMS INVENTORY
Current Through January 1988

CIP Codes	Degree Program (and Old HEGIS Code)	UF	FSU	FAMU	USF	FAU	UWF	UCF	FIU	UNF
01.	Agribusiness and Agricultural Production									
01.0102	Agricultural Business (0112)			B						
01.0103	Food and Resource Economics (0111)	B M D								
01.0603	Ornamental Horticulture (0109) (was 02.0404 until 7/86)	B		B[15]						
01.0605	Landscape Design (0204)			B						
02.	Agricultural Sciences									
02.0101	Agriculture, General (0101)			B						
02.0201	Animal Science (0104)	B M D		B[15]						
02.0206	Dairy Science (0105)	B M								
02.0209	Poultry Science (0106)	B M								
02.0301	Food Science & Nutrition (0113)	B M D								
02.0401	Plant Sciences (0120)	B								
02.0402	Agronomy (0102)	B M D								
02.0403	Horticulture (Fruit & Vegetable Crops) (0108)	B								
02.0403	Horticulture Science (0108)	M D								
02.0501	Soils Science (0103)	B M D								
03.	Renewable Natural Resources									
03.0501	Forest Resources & Conservation (0114)	B M D								
04.	Architecture & Environmental Design									
04.0201	Architecture (0202)	B M D		B M	M[10]					
04.0301	Urban & Regional Planning (0206)	M	M D			M				
04.0501	Interior Design (0203)	B	B M						B	
04.0601	Landscape Architecture (0204)	BM[11]							M[11]	
05.	Area and Ethnic Studies									
05.0102	American Studies (USA) (0319)	B	B M		B M					
05.0103	Asian Studies (0301)	B	B M							
05.0105	Slavic & East European Studies (0311)		B M							
05.0106	European Studies (0310)									
05.0107	Latin American Studies (0308)	M	B							
05.0198	Hispanic Studies (1130) (was 05.0115 until 7/86)								M	
05.0201	Afro-American (Black) Studies (2211)			B	B					

ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAMS INVENTORY, Continued
Current Through January 1988

CIP Codes	Degree Program (and Old HEGIS code)	UF	FSU	FAMU	USF	FAU	UWF	UCF	FIU	UNF
06.	Business & Management									
06.0101	Business, General (0501)		B M D		B M			B M	B M	M
06.0201	Accounting (0502)	B M	B M	B	B M	B M	B M	B M	B M	B M
06.0301	Banking & Finance (0504)	B M	B M	B	B	B	B	B	B M	B M
06.0401	Business Management & Administration (0506)	B M D	B M	B M	B M D	B M D[7]	B M	B M D	B M D[7]	B
06.0501	Business Economics (0517)			B	B M		B	B M		B
06.0701	Hotel and Restaurant Management (0508)		B					B	B M	
06.0705	Transportation Management (0510)								B	B
06.0801	Insurance & Risk Management (0512)	B M	B M						B	B
06.0901	International Business Management (0513)		B			B[15]			B M	
06.1303	Management Science & Systems (0507) (was 06.1302 until 7/86)				B	B[15]				
06.1401	Marketing Management (0509)	B M	B M	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
06.1601	Personnel Management (0515)					B			B	M
06.1701	Real Estate (0511)	B M	B			B			B M	B
06.1901	Taxation							M	M	
08.	Marketing and Distribution									
08.1104	Tourism & Travel Management (0520)								B	
09.	Communications									
09.0101	Communications, General (0601)	M D	B M D		B M	B M	B M	B M	B M	B
09.0201	Advertising (0604)	B	B							
09.0401	Journalism (0602)	B		B				B		
09.0402	Magazine Production (0602)			B						
09.0501	Public Relations (0606)	B								
09.0701	Radio and Television (0603)	B						B		
10.	Communications Technologies									
10.0104	Radio & TV Production & Broadcasting Technology (0605)							B		
11.	Computer & Information Sciences									
11.0101	Computer & Information Science, General (0701)	B M E D	B M D	B[15]		B M[15]	B	B M D	B M D[5]	B M
11.0301	Data Processing (0703)			B[15]						
11.0401	Information Sciences & Systems (0702)								B	
11.0501	Systems Analysis (0705)						M			

CIP Codes	Degree Program (and Old HEGIS code)	UF	FSU	FAMU	USF	FAU	UWF	UCF	FIU	UNF
13.	Education									
13.0301	Curriculum & Instruction (0829)	MSD	B MSD		MSD	MSD		S D	S^{6}D^{6}	S^{1}D^{1}
13.0401	Educational Administration, General (0827)	MSD	MSD	M	MSD	MSD	M D^{2}	MS^{6}D^{6}	MS^{6}D^{6}	MS^{1}D^{1}
13.0404	Educational Supervision (0828)			M						
13.0406	Higher Education Administration (0805)	SD	MSD				D^{2}			
13.0501	Educational Media (0845)		M					B M		
13.0601	Instructional Systems (0844)		MSD							
13.0603	Educational Statistics & Research (0824)	MSD	MSD							
13.0604	Educational Testing, Evaluation & Measurement (0825)		MSD							
13.0701	International Development Education								M	
13.0801	School Psychology (2015)	MSD		M	M			M	M	
13.0802	Educational Psychology (0822)	MSD	MSD							B
13.0803	Agency, Correctional & Developmental Counseling (0862)	MSD								
13.0901	Social Foundations of Education (0821)	MSD	MSD			M				
13.1001	Special Education, General (0808)	MSD	B MSD		B M	B M D^{7}	B M	B MS^{1}D^{1}	M D^{7}	B M
13.1004	Education of the Gifted & Talented (0811)				M					
13.1005	Education of the Emotionally Handicapped (0816)	M			B M				B M	
13.1006	Education of the Mentally Handicapped (0810)	B M	B MSD		B M		B		B M	
13.1007	Education of the Multiple Handicapped (0820)		B MSD							
13.1009	Visual Disabilities (0814)		B MS							
13.1011	Special Learning Disabilities (0818)	M			B M				B M	
13.1011	Emotional Disturbances/Learning Disabilities (0818)		B MSD							
13.1012	Speech Corrections (0815)	B M								
13.1013	Clinical Teaching & Special Education (0861)						M			
13.1101	Student Counseling & Personnel Services (0826)	MSD	MSD	M	M	MS		MS^{1}D^{1}	M	MS^{1}D^{1}
13.1102	Student Personnel in Higher Education (0863)	MSD								
13.1103	Counselor Education (0864)	D								
13.1201	Adult & Continuing Education (0807)		MSD	M	M	M D^{7}	D^{2}		M D^{7}	
13.1202	Elementary Education (0802)	B M	B MSD	B M	B M	B M	B M	B M	B M	B M
13.1203	Junior High/Middle School Education (0804)					B	B			
13.1204	Pre-Elementary Education (0823)	B M	B MSD			B M	B M		M	
13.1205	Secondary Education (0803)	M	MSD	M						B M
13.1206	Junior College Teaching (0806)				M	SD		S^{6}D^{6}	D^{6}	
13.1207	Urban Education								M	
13.1301	Agriculture Education (0840)	B M		M						
13.1302	Art Education (0831)	B M	B MSD	B	B M	B M	B	B M	B M	B M
13.1303	Business Education (0838)			B M	B M		B	B M		B
13.1305	English Education (0848)	B M	B MSD	B M	B M	B	B M	B M	B M	
13.1306	Foreign Languages Education (0841)	B M	B MSD		B M	B	B	B M	B M	
13.1307	Health Education (0837)	B M	B M		B		B M		B M	
13.1308	Home Economics Education (0840)		B M						B M	
13.1311	Mathematics Education (0833)	B M	B MSD	B M	B M	B	B M	B M	B M	B M

ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAMS INVENTORY, Continued
Current Through January 1988

CIP Codes	Degree Program (and Old HEGIS code)	UF	FSU	FAMU	USF	FAU	UWF	UCF	FIU	UNF
13.1312	Music Education (0832)	B M	B M D	B	B M	B M	B	B M	B M	B M
13.1314	Physical Education (0835)	B M	B MSD	B M	B M	B M	B M	B M	B M	B M
13.1315	Reading Education (0830)	M	B MSD		M	M	M	M	M	
13.1316	Science Education (0834)	B M	B MSD	B M	B M	B	B M	B M	B M	B M
13.1318	Social Studies Education (0855)	B M	B MSD	B M	B M	B	B M	B M	B M	
13.1320	Trade & Industrial Education (0839)	M	SD	B M	B M		B M D[2]	B M	B M	B M
13.1398	Speech, Communications & English Education (0847) (was 13.1321 until 7/86)				B M		B M	B M		
13.1322	Classics Education (0849)				B					
13.1323	Humanities Education (0851)				B M					
13.1324	Movement Science Education (0856)		B MSD							
13.1325	Mass Communications - English Education (0858)				B					
13.1326	Science & Human Affairs Education (0860)		B MSD							
13.1327	Secondary Science and/or Math Teaching		B							
14.	Engineering									
14.0101	Engineering, General (0901)	B ME			B M D			M		
14.0201	Aerospace Engineering (0902)	B MED						B		
14.0301	Agricultural Engineering (0903)	B MED								
14.0701	Chemical Engineering (0906)	B MED	B M	B M	B M D					
14.0801	Civil Engineering (0908)	B MED	B M	B M	B M D			B M D	B M	
14.0802	Environmental Systems (0997)							M		
14.0901	Computer Engineering (0998)				B M D	M D[5]		B M D		
14.1001	Electrical, Electronics & Communications Engineering (0909)	B MED	B M	B M	B M D	B M D[5]		B M D	B M	
14.1101	Engineering Mechanics (0921)	MED								
14.1401	Environmental Health Engineering (0922)	B MED						B M D	M	
14.1701	Industrial Engineering (0913)		B	B	B M D			B M D	B	
14.1901	Mechanical Engineering (0910)	B MED	B M	B M	B M D	B M D		B M D	B	
14.2001	Metallurgical & Materials Engineering (0914)	B MED								
14.2301	Nuclear Engineering (0920)	B MED								
14.2401	Coastal & Ocean Engineering (0926)	MED				B M D				
14.2601	Land Surveying (0925)	B								
14.2701	Systems Engineering (0927)	B								
14.2701	Industrial & Systems Engineering (0927)	B MED				M			B M	
14.9901	Engineering Management (0928)				M					
15.	Engineering & Engineering-Related Technologies									
15.0101	Architectural Design & Construction Technology (0235)			B					B	
15.0103	Building Construction (0208)	B M							B M	

ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAMS INVENTORY, Continued
Current Through January 1988

CIP Codes	Degree Program (and Old HEGIS code)	UF	FSU	FAMU	USF	FAU	UWF	UCF	FIU	UNF
15.0104	Construction Engineering Technology (0986)			B					B	
15.0201	Civil Technology (0987)			B						
15.0202	Design Technology (0991)							B		
15.0301	Computer/Information Systems Technology							B		
15.0303	Electronic Engineering Technology (0980)			B				B		
15.0504	Environmental Technology & Urban Systems (0992)							B	B M	
15.0603	Industrial Technology (0984)						B		B	
15.0805	Mechanical Engineering Technology								B	
15.9901	Engineering Technology (0925)				B				B	B
15.9902	Operations Technology (0985)							B		
16.	Foreign Languages									
16.0101	Foreign Languages, Multiple Emphasis (1101)				B			B		
16.0402	Russian (1106)	B	B		B					
16.0403	Slavic Languages (1115)		M							
16.0501	German (1103)	B M	B M		B	B M			B	
16.0601	Greek (1110)		B M							
16.0901	French (1102)	B M	B M D		B M	B M	B	B	B	
16.0902	Italian (1104)		B		B				B	
16.0903	Latin (1109)	M	B M							
16.0904	Portuguese (1117)								B	
16.0905	Spanish (1105)	B M	B M D		B M	B M	B	B	B	
16.0906	Romantic Languages (1130)	D								
17.	Allied Health									
17.0209	Radiologic (Medical) Technology (1225)							B		
17.0302	Clinical Chemistry (1933)				B					
17.0310	Medical Technology (1223)	B	B		B	B	B	B	B M	
17.0407	Vocational Rehabilitation (0842)	M	B MSD		M					
17.0508	Physician Assisting (1260)	B								
17.0806	Music Therapy (1828)		B M							
17.0807	Occupational Therapy (1208)	B M							B M	
17.0811	Orthotics/Prosthetics								B	
17.0813	Physical Therapy (1212)	B		B					B	
17.0818	Respiratory Therapy (1273)			B				B		
17.9901	Allied Health Services (1201)	B								
18.	Health Sciences									
18.0103	Speech-Language Pathology/Audiology (1220)		B MAD		M			B M		
18.0401	Dentistry (1204)	P								
18.0701	Health Services Administration (1202)	M		B		B			B M	

ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAMS INVENTORY, Continued
Current Through January 1988

CIP Codes	Degree Program (and Old HEGIS code)	UF	FSU	FAMU	USF	FAU	UWF	UCF	FIU	UNF
18.0703	Medical Records Administration (1215)			B				B	B	
18.0704	Health Science (1202)							M		B M
18.1001	Medicine (1206)	P			P					
18.1020	Health and Human Performance	D								
18.1098	Medical Sciences (1285) (was 18.1029 until 7/86)	M D			M D					
18.1101	Nursing (1203)	B M D	B M	B	B M	B M	B	B	B	B
18.1401	Pharmacy (1211)	B MPD		B MPD						
18.2201	Public Health (1214)				M D				M[9]	
18.2401	Veterinary Medicine (1218)	P								
18.2402	Veterinary Science (1286)	M								
19.	Home Economics									
19.0101	Home Economics, General (1301)		B D						B[13]	
19.0503	Dietetics/Human Nutritional Services (1306)	B	B M						B M	
19.0701	Home and Family Life (1305)		B M							
19.0704	Marriage and Family Living (1310)		D							
19.0705	Gerontology (Aging) (1309)				B M					
19.0901	Textiles & Clothing (1303)		B M						B	
22.	Law									
22.0101	Law (1401)	P	P							
22.0103	Legal Assisting (1408 or 2197)						B	B		
22.0104	Taxation Law (1409)	M								
23.	Letters									
23.0101	English, General (1501)	B M D	B M D	B	B M D	B M	B M	B M	B	M
23.0201	Classics (1504)	B M	B M		B M[1]					
23.0601	Linguistics (Phonetics, Semantics Philology) (1505)	M D			B M	B M			M	
23.0801	Literature (1502)									B
23.1001	Speech, Debate, & Forensics (1506)	B M D			B M			B		
24.	Liberal/General Studies									
24.0101	Liberal Arts and Sciences (4901)	AA	AA	AA	AA B M	AA	AA	AA B	AA B	AA B
24.0103	Interdisciplinary Humanities & Fine Arts (4912)							B		
24.0104	New College (4913)				B					
24.0198	Humanities (1513) (was 24.0102 until 7/86)		B M D		B	B		B		

ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAMS INVENTORY, Continued
Current Through January 1988

CIP Codes	Degree Program (and Old HEGIS code)	UF	FSU	FAMU	USF	FAU	UWF	UCF	FIU	UNF
25.	Library & Archival Sciences									
25.0401	Library Science, General (1601)		B[8]MAD		M					
26.	Life Sciences									
26.0101	Biology, General (0401)		B M D	B	B D	B M	B M	B M	B M	B
26.0201	Biochemistry (0414)	M D	B							
26.0301	Botany, General (0402)	B M D			B M			B		
26.0305	Plant Pathology (0404)	B M D								
26.0501	Microbiology (0411)	B M D			B M			B M		
26.0603	Ecology (Limnology) (0420)							B		
26.0607	Marine Biology (0418)						B			
26.0701	Zoology (0407)	B M D			B M			B		
26.0702	Entomology & Nematology (0421)	B M D								
26.0702	Entomology, Aquatic Entomology, & Structural Pest Control (0428)			B[15]						
27.	Mathematics									
27.0101	Mathematics, General (1701)	B M D	B M D	B	B M D	B M D	B M	B	B	B
27.0301	Applied Mathematics/Mathematical Sciences (1703)							M	B M	M
27.0501	Statistics (1702)	B M D	B M D					B M	B	B
30.	Multi/Interdisciplinary Studies									
30.0101	Biological & Physical Sciences (4902)					B	B			B
30.0102	Marine Science (4908)				M D					
30.0103	Interdisciplinary Natural Sciences (4911)				B					
30.0401	Humanities & Social Sciences (4903)				B		B M		B	
30.0698	Environmental Resource Management & Planning (2110) (was 30.0801 until 7/86)						B			
30.0701	Women's Studies (4998)				B					
30.9901	Independent/Interdisciplinary Studies (4910)	B			B					
31.	Parks & Recreation									
31.0301	Parks & Recreation Management (2103)	B M	B M						B M	
38.	Philosophy, Religion & Theology									
38.0101	Philosophy (1509)	B M D	B M D		B M	B	B	B	B	
38.0201	Religious Studies (1510)	B M	B M		B M		B		B	
38.0310	Philosophy & Religion			B						

ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAMS INVENTORY, Continued
Current Through January 1988

CIP Codes	Degree Program (and Old HEGIS code)	UF	FSU	FAMU	USF	FAU	UWF	UCF	FIU	UNF
40.	Physical Sciences									
40.0101	Radiation Physics (1901)		B							
40.0201	Astronomy (1911)	B M D								
40.0401	Atmospheric Sciences & Meteorology (1913)		B M D							
40.0501	Chemistry (1905)	B M D	B M D	B	B M D	B M D[1]	B	B	B M	B
40.0506	Chemical Physics (1927)		M D							
40.0507	Industrial Chemistry (1942)							M		
40.0508	Chemical Sciences (1943)		B							
40.0601	Geology (1914)	B M D	B M D		B M	B			B M	
40.0702	Oceanography (1919)		M D							
40.0704	Environmental Studies (1940)								B	
40.0801	Physics (1902)	B M D	B M D	B	B M	B M D	B M	B M	B M	
40.0805	Geophysical Fluid Dynamics (1930)		D							
40.0809	Molecular Biophysics (1931)		D							
42.	Psychology									
42.0101	Psychology, General (2001)	B M D	B M D	B	B M D	B M D[7]	B M	B	B M D[7]	B
42.0201	Clinical Psychology (2003)							M		
42.0601	Counseling Psychology (2004)	D					M			M
42.0901	Industrial & Organizational Psychology (2008)						M	M		
42.1601	Social Psychology (2005)					B				
42.1701	Human Factors Psychology							D		
43.	Protective Services									
43.0103	Criminal Justice Administration								M	
43.0104	Criminal Justice Studies (2105)	B	B M D	B	B M	B	B	B	B	B M
43.0106	Forensic Science (1925)							B		
43.0202	Fire Science & Safety (2107)								B[14]	
44.	Public Affairs									
44.0201	Community Services (2101)									M
44.0401	Public Administration (2102)		M D		M	B M D[7]	M	B M	B M D[7]	M
44.0701	Social Work, General (2104)		B M D	B	B M	B	B	B	B M	
45.	Social Sciences									
45.0101	Social Sciences, General (2201 or 4909)		B M	M	B	B	B	B		
45.0201	Anthropology (2202)	B M D	B M D[1]		B M D	B M	B	B		
45.0501	Demography (2215)		M							

ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAMS INVENTORY, Continued
Current Through January 1988

CIP Codes	Degree Program (and Old HEGIS code)	UF	FSU	FAMU	USF	FAU	UWF	UCF	FIU	UNF
45.0601	Economics (2204)	B M D	B M D	B	B	B M	B	B	B M D	B
45.0701	Geography (2206)	B M D	B M		B M	B M				
45.0801	History (2205)	B M D	B M D	B	B M	B M	B M	B M	B M[6]	B M[1]
45.0901	International Relations (2210)	M D	B M	B	B		B		B M	
45.1001	Political Science & Government (2207)	B M D	B M D	B	B M	B M	B M	B M	B	B
45.1101	Sociology (2208)	B M D	B M D	B	B M	B M	B	B M	B	B
50.	Visual & Performing Arts									
50.0101	Visual & Performing Arts/Fine Arts (1001)			B			B	B		B
50.0301	Dance (1008)		B M		B					
50.0402	Graphic Design (1009)	B	B M	B						
50.0501	Dramatic Arts (1007)	B M	B M D	B	B	B M	B	B	B	
50.0701	Fine Arts (Painting, Drawing, Sculpture) (1002)	B M	B M		B M	B	B	B	B	B
50.0703	Art History & Appreciation (1003)	B M	B M D		M		B			
50.0801	Graphics Arts Technology (0981)			B						
50.0901	Music, General (1005)		B			B			B	
50.0902	Music History & Appreciation (1006)	B	B							
50.0903	Music Performance (1004)	B M	B M D	B	B M		B	B		B
50.0904	Music Composition (1021)		B M D							
50.0905	Music Theory (1022)		B M							
50.0905	Music (1022)		D							
50.0906	Opera Production (1029)		M							
50.0907	Musicology (1006)		M							

AA Associate in Arts Degree
B Bachelor Degree
M Master Degree
A Advanced Master Degree
S Specialist Degree
E Engineer Degree
P Professional Degree
D Doctoral Degree (Ph.D. or Ed.D.)

1 Cooperative Degree Program with existing UF program
2 Cooperative Degree Program with existing FSU programs
3 Cooperative Degree Program with existing FAU programs
4 Cooperative Degree Program with existing USF programs
5 Affiliated Degree Program with existing UCF Program
6 Affiliated Degree Program with existing FAU program
7 Affiliated Degree Program Shared Between FAU and FIU
8 Program to be Terminated as August 1990
9 Affiliated Degree Program with existing Univ. of Miami program
10 Cooperative Degree Program with existing FAMU program
11 Affiliated Degree Program Shared Between UF and FIU
12 Affiliated Degree Program with existing UF program
13 Program to be Terminated as of August 1988
14 Program to be Terminated as of June 1988
15 Program to be Terminated as of May/June 1990

AP
CL/jb January 19, 1988
Code: JAN.88.DEGREE INVENTORY